arXiv:math/0610375v1 [math.CV] 11 Oct 2006

# Classification of Levi degenerate homogeneous CR-manifolds in dimension 5

Gregor Fels and Wilhelm Kaup

**Abstract:** In this paper we present new examples of homogeneous 2-nondegenerate CR-manifolds of dimension 5 and give, up to local CR-equivalence, a full classification of all CR-manifolds of this type.

1. Introduction . . . . . . . . 1

PART 1: Levi degenerate CR-manifolds

2. Preliminaries . . . . . . . . 6
3. Tube manifolds . . . . . . . . 7
4. Tube manifolds over cones . . . . . . . . 11
5. Some examples . . . . . . . . 14
6. Levi degenerate CR-manifolds associated with an endomorphism . . . . . . . . 16
7. Homogeneous 2-nondegenerate manifolds of CR-dimension 2 . . . . . . . . 22
8. Homogeneous 2-nondegenerate CR-manifolds in dimension 5 . . . . . . . . 26

PART 2: The classification

9. Lie-theoretic characterization of locally homogeneous CR-manifolds . . . . . . . . 29
10. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ has small semisimple part . . . . . . . . 33
11. The cases $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(2,3)$ and $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(1,3)$ . . . . . . . . 36
12. The case $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ . . . . . . . . 38
13. The case $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ . . . . . . . . 41
14. Reduction to the case where $\mathfrak{g}$ is solvable and of dimension 5 . . . . . . . . 43
15. The existence of a 3-dimensional abelian ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ suffices . . . . . . . . 44
16. The final steps . . . . . . . . 49
References . . . . . . . . 52

## 1. Introduction

The main topic of this paper is the study of real-analytic CR-manifolds $M$ with everywhere degenerate Levi form. In particular, for homogeneous manifolds of this type, we develop methods for the computation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ of infinitesimal CR-transformations at every $a \in M$. We also classify up to local CR-equivalence all locally homogeneous degenerate CR-manifolds in dimension 5.

In this context, a well studied example of a homogeneous Levi degenerate CR-manifold is the quadratic hypersurface

$$\mathcal{M} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^3 : (\mathrm{Re}\, z_1)^2 + (\mathrm{Re}\, z_2)^2 = (\mathrm{Re}\, z_3)^2,\ \mathrm{Re}\, z_3 > 0\}\ ,$$

compare e.g. [16], [19], [26] and [33]. This 5-dimensional CR-manifold has several remarkable properties and serves as motivation for various considerations in this paper. Notice that $\mathcal{M}$ can also be written as tube manifold

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F} + i\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{F} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1^2 + x_2^2 = x_3^2,\ x_3 > 0\}$$

---

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 32M17, 32M25, 32V25.

is the future light cone in 3-dimensional space-time. A glance at this description shows that $\mathcal{M}$ is homogeneous under a group of complex-affine transformations. It is less obvious that the Lie algebras of *global* and *local* infinitesimal CR-transformations at $a \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, a)$, are both isomorphic to $\mathfrak{so}(2,3)$, and hence have dimension 10, compare [26]. Also the following 'globalization' is known: The group $\mathrm{SO}(2,3)$ acts on the complex quadric $\boldsymbol{Q_3} \subset \mathbb{P}_4(\mathbb{C})$ by biholomorphic transformations and has a hypersurface orbit that contains $\mathcal{M}$ as a dense domain.

The cone $\mathcal{F}$ clearly is a disjoint union of affine half-lines. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}$ is a disjoint union of complex half-planes, actually $\mathcal{M}$ is a fiber bundle with typical fiber $\mathbb{H}^+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \mathrm{Re}(z) > 0\}$. However, the total space $\mathcal{M}$ is not even locally CR-equivalent to a product $\mathbb{H}^+ \times M'$ with $M'$ a CR-manifold. Notice that the Levi form in both cases, i.e., for $\mathcal{M}$ and for a product of $\mathbb{H}^+$ with a Levi nondegenerate 3-dimensional CR-manifold $M'$, has exactly one non-zero eigenvalue at every point. Hence, one needs further invariants to distinguish those CR-manifolds. While every product $M' \times \mathbb{C}$ is holomorphically degenerate, the crucial fact here is that the light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$ is nondegenerate in a higher order sense: To be precise, $\mathcal{M}$ is 2-nondegenerate at every point, and we refer to [6] and also to [5], 11.1, for the notion of $k$-nondegeneracy.

In the non-homogeneous setting, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and fixed manifold dimension it is not difficult to construct large classes of CR-manifolds, even hypersurfaces, which are $k$-nondegenerate at some points, but are Levi nondegenerate in a dense open subset. It seems to be much harder to construct CR-manifolds which are $k$-nondegenerate everywhere for $k \geq 2$. Note that the CR-dimension of a *homogeneous* $M$ is an upper bound for the degree $k$ of nondegeneracy. Hence, the lowest manifold dimension for which everywhere 2-nondegenerate CR-manifolds can exist is 5. which raises the intriguing question whether besides the light cone tube there exist further 2-nondegenerate homogeneous CR-manifolds in dimension 5. So far, all known examples in dimension finally turned out to be locally CR-isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}$, compare e.g. [17], [26], [20], [19], [3], and the belief arose that there are no others.

The main objective of this paper is to show that there are actually infinitely many locally mutually non-equivalent examples and to provide a full classification. Starting point is the following simple observation: Suppose that $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an affinely homogeneous (connected) submanifold of dimension say $d < n$. Then the tube $M := F + i\mathbb{R}^n$ is a generic CR-submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^n$ of CR-dimension $d$ and is homogeneous under a group of complex-affine transformations. Indeed, every real-affine transformation leaving $F$ invariant extends to a complex-affine transformation leaving $M$ invariant and, furthermore, $M$ is invariant under all translations $z \mapsto z + iv$ with $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Clearly, the crucial question is, when is $M$ $k$-nondegenerate and when are two tubes $M, M'$ of this type locally CR-equivalent?

The classification of all affinely homogeneous surfaces $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ can be found in [14] and [15]. In particular, a complete list (up to local affine equivalence and in a slightly different formulation) of all degenerate types that are not a cylinder, is given by the following examples (1) – (3).

(1) $F = \mathcal{F}$ the future light cone as above.

(2a) $F = \{\, r\,(\cos t, \sin t, e^{\omega t}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with $\omega > 0$ arbitrary.

(2b) $F = \{\, r\,(1, t, e^{t}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

(2c) $F = \{\, r\,(1, e^{t}, e^{\theta t}) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with $\theta > 2$ arbitrary.

(3) $F = \{\, c(t) + r\,c'(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $c(t) := (t, t^2, t^3)$ parameterizes the *twisted cubic* $\{(t, t^2, t^3) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $c'(t) = (1, 2t, 3t^2)$.

Notice that the limit case $\omega = 0$ in (2a) gives the future light cone $\mathcal{F}$, while the limit case $\theta = 2$ in (2c) gives the linearly homogeneous surface $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1x_3 = x_2^2,\ x_1 > 0,\ x_2 > 0\}$, which is locally, but not globally linearly equivalent to $\mathcal{F}$. In fact, $\mathcal{F}$ is linearly equivalent to the cone
$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1x_3 = x_2^2,\ x_1 + x_3 > 0\}$.

As our first main result we show, compare 8.8 and 8.9 for details:

**Theorem I:** *For every surface $F$ in* (1) – (3) *the corresponding tube manifold $M := F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ is a homogeneous* 2*-nondegenerate CR-submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^3$ and any two of them are pairwise locally CR-inequivalent. Furthermore, for every $F$ in* (2a) – (3) *and every $a \in M = F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ the following holds:*

(i) *The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ is solvable and has dimension* 5.
(ii) *The stability group $\operatorname{Aut}(M, a)$ is trivial.*
(iii) *Every homogeneous real-analytic CR-manifold $M'$, that is locally CR-equivalent to $M$, is already globally CR-equivalent to $M$.*

Notice that, a priori, there is no reason why the $F$ in (1) – (3), although known to be locally affinely inequivalent, should have locally CR-inequivalent tubes (for nondegenerate affinely homogeneous surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$, for instance, there are counterexamples).

We actually prove an analog of Theorem I in every dimension $n \geq 3$, where the same trichotomy occurs as above: Consider the following surfaces $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

(1') $F = \mathcal{F}^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 > 0,\ x_2 > 0 \text{ and } x_j = x_2^{j-1}/x_1^{j-2} \text{ for } 3 \leq j \leq n\}$.
(2') $F = \{re^{t\varphi}(a) \in \mathbb{R}^n : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $\varphi$ is an endomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^n$ having $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as cyclic vector (i.e., the iterates $\varphi^k(a)$, $k \geq 0$ span $\mathbb{R}^n$) and the $n$ eigenvalues of $\varphi$ do not form an arithmetic progression in $\mathbb{C}$.
(3') $F = \{c(t) + rc'(t) : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $c(t) := (t, t^2, \ldots, t^n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ parameterizes the twisted $n$-ic in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In Sections 6 and 7 we show among other statements: For every $F, F'$ from (1') – (3') the tube manifolds $M := F + i\mathbb{R}^n$, $M' := F' + i\mathbb{R}^n$ are affinely homogeneous generic 2-nondegenerate submanifolds of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with CR-dimension 2. Furthermore, $M$, $M'$ are locally CR-equivalent if and only if $F$, $F'$ are globally affinely equivalent, and this holds if and only if for given $a \in M$, $a' \in M'$ the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$, $\mathfrak{hol}(M', a')$ are isomorphic. In case $F = \mathcal{F}^n$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ contains a copy of $\mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and hence is not solvable. In all other cases, i.e. $F$ comes from (2') or (3'), the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ is solvable of dimension $n + 2$ and the stability group $\operatorname{Aut}(M, a)$ has order at most 2.

Let us briefly comment on the proof of Theorem I: Once defining equations for an $F$ under consideration are explicitly known (this is quite obvious for the types (1) – (3), compare Section 8, but seems to be hard for the types (2'), (3')), one can compute by standard methods the order $k$ of nondegeneracy. However, the amount of calculation necessary to determine $k$ in such a way grows very fast with $k$ and with the dimension or codimension of $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. This is one of the reasons, especially with an eye on possible generalizations, to choose a different approach, which does not use explicit equations. For instance, given an arbitrary submanifold $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which is (locally) *affinely homogeneous*, we present a simple criterion (Proposition 3.7) which allows to determine quickly the order $k$ of nondegeneracy for the corresponding tube manifold.

The hard part of the proof is to show that the various tubes $F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ are actually locally inequivalent as CR-manifolds. Recall that for real-analytic, not necessary homogeneous, *hypersurfaces with nondegenerate Levi form* there exist local invariants which determine each $M$ up to local CR-equivalence due to the fundamental work of Cartan, Tanaka and Chern-Moser. However, an analogues approach is not available for $M$ of higher codimensions or when the Levi form is degenerate. To distinguish the various tubes $F + i\mathbb{R}^3$, we develop a method (valid also in greater generality) which enables us to determine explicitly the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ of infinitesimal CR-transformations of the various CR-germs $(M, a)$ (see Section 2 for basic definitions and Sections 6 for further details).

The CR-manifolds occurring in the previous theorem are quite special as they all are tube manifolds. Moreover, all but one (namely the twisted cubic case in (3)) are actually conical. In the Levi nondegenerate case, many (homogeneous) examples are known which are not locally CR-equivalent to any tube manifold. For instance, the unit sphere subbundle of $TS^3$ with its canonical CR-structure is such an example.

Therefore, our second main result came quite unexpected to us:

**Theorem II.** *Every 5-dimensional locally homogeneous 2-nondegenerate CR-manifold $M$ is locally CR-equivalent to $F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ with $F$ being one of the surfaces in* (1) – (3).

For the precise definition of local homogeneity we refer to Section 2. A priori, locally homogeneous CR-manifolds might exist which are not locally CR-equivalent to any globally homogeneous one. As a by-product of the above 2 results we can see that such a pathology does not happen in the case under consideration. Theorem II gives a classification of all (abstract) 2-nondegenerate locally homogeneous CR-manifolds in dimension 5 up to local CR-equivalence. In fact, using Cartan's classification [11] of the 3-dimensional Levi nondegenerate homogeneous CR-manifolds, the following result holds.

**Classification.** *Every 5-dimensional locally homogeneous CR-manifold $M$ with degenerate Levi form is locally CR-equivalent to one of the following:*

(i) $M = F + i\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ *and $F$ is one of the surfaces* (1) – (3) *from above.*

(ii) $M = \mathbb{C} \times M'$, *where $M'$ is one of the 3-dimensional Levi nondegenerate CR-manifolds from Cartan's list in* [11].

(iii) $M = \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ *or* $M = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}^3$ *with $\mathbb{R}^3$ totally real.*

*The manifolds in* (i) *are all $2$-nondegenerate and in* (ii) – (iii) *are holomorphically degenerate. Also, the manifolds in* (iii) *are just the Levi flat ones.*

With Theorem II the following question arises naturally for higher codimension: *Are there, up to local CR-equivalence, further locally homogeneous $2$-nondegenerate CR-manifolds of CR-dimension 2 besides those that are tubes over the surfaces $F$ in* (1') – (3') *above?* Notice in this context that every locally homogeneous 2-nondegenerate CR-manifold of dimension 6 necessarily has CR-dimension 2.

For 5-dimensional CR-hypersurfaces with *nondegenerate* Levi form, that is, when Chern-Moser invariants are available, there already exists a partial classification: Locally homogeneous CR-hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ with stability groups of positive dimension have been classified by Loboda in terms of local equations in normal form, see [27], [28], [29].

The paper is organized as follows. After recalling some necessary preliminaries in Section 2 we discuss in Section 3 tube manifolds $M = F \oplus i\mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ over real-analytic submanifolds $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. It turns out that the CR-structure of $M$ is closely related to the real-affine structure of the base $F$. For instance, the Levi form of $M$ is essentially the sesquilinear extension of the second fundamental form of the submanifold $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Generalizing the notion of the second fundamental form we define higher order invariants for $F$ (see 3.4). In the uniform case these invariants precisely detect the $k$-nondegeneracy of the corresponding CR-manifold $M = F \oplus i\mathbb{R}^n$. It is known that the (uniform) $k$-nondegeneracy of a real-analytic CR-manifold $M$ together with minimality ensures that the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ are finite-dimensional, and is equivalent to this in the special class of locally homogeneous CR-manifolds. For submanifolds $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which in addition are homogeneous under a group of affine transformations, a simple criterion for $k$-nondegeneracy of the associated tube manifold $M$ is given in Proposition 3.7.

In Section 4 these results are applied to the case where $F$ is conical in $\mathbb{R}^n$, that is, locally invariant under dilations $z \mapsto tz$ for $t$ near $1 \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case $M$ is always *Levi degenerate.* Assuming that $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ is finite dimensional (which automatically is the case for minimal and finitely nondegenerate CR-manifolds) we develop some basic techniques for the explicit computation of $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$. The main results in Section 4 are the following: We prove that under the finiteness assumption $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ consists only of polynomial vector fields and carries a natural graded structure, see Proposition 4.2. We prove (under the same assumptions, see Proposition 4.4.ii) that local CR-equivalences between two such tube manifolds are always rational maps (even if these manifolds are not real-algebraic). Furthermore, jet determination estimates are provided (4.4.iv). In the special situation where $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ consists of affine germs only, these results are further strengthened.

In Section 5 we illustrate by examples how our methods can be applied. In Example 5.1 we present to every $c \geq 1$ and $k \in \{2,3,4\}$ a homogeneous submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^n$ which is $k$-nondegenerate, of codimension $c$ and of CR-dimension $k$. We close this section investigating the tubes $M^\alpha_{p,q}$ over the cones $F^\alpha_{p,q} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q}_+ : \sum \varepsilon_j x^\alpha_j = 0\}$ with $p$ positive and $q$ negative $\varepsilon_j$'s and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^*$. Using our methods from the previous section we explicitly determine the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M^\alpha_{p,q}, a)$ for arbitrary integers $\alpha \geq 2$ and $p \geq q \geq 1$.

In Section 6, we construct homogeneous CR-submanifolds $M = M^{\varphi,d} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ of tube type, depending on the choice of an endomorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, an integer $1 < d < n$ and a cyclic vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $\varphi$ in the following way: The powers $\varphi^0, \varphi^1, \ldots, \varphi^{d-1}$ span an abelian Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ and, in turn, give a cone $F := \exp(\mathfrak{h})a \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. For $\varphi$ which admits a cyclic vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the corresponding tube manifold $M^{\varphi,d} = F + i\mathbb{R}^n$ is 2-nondegenerate, minimal and of CR-dimension $d$. The key result here is the explicit determination of the CR-invariant $\mathfrak{hol}(M^{\varphi,d}, a)$ for $\varphi$ in 'general position' (Propositions 6.5 and 6.17). The precise meaning for $\varphi$ of being in 'general position' is stated in Lemma 6.8. Further results are, again for $\varphi$ in general position, that the tube manifold $M$ is simply connected and has trivial stability group at every point. As a consequence, the manifolds $M$ of this type have the following remarkable property: *Every homogeneous (real-analytic) CR-manifold locally CR-equivalent to $M$ is globally CR-equivalent to $M$.*

In Section 7 the results from Section 6 are further refined in the case of homogeneous CR-manifolds $M^\varphi := M^{\varphi,2} := F^\varphi + i\mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ of CR-dimension 2 but without restrictions on the codimension. In fact, every minimal and locally homogeneous tube CR-manifold $M := S + i\mathbb{R}^n$ with a conical 2-dimensional $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is locally CR-equivalent to $M^{\varphi,2}$ for some cyclic $\varphi$. In this section also the case when $\varphi$ is not in 'general position', i.e., the characteristic roots do form an arithmetic progression (see Lemma 6.8) is treated. The main results here are: Whether a cyclic $\varphi$ is in general position or not, the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M^\varphi, a)$ (Proposition 7.3) and the global automorphism groups $\mathrm{Aut}(M^\varphi)$ (Proposition 7.5) are determined. Furthermore, the problem of local and global CR-equivalence among the $M^\varphi$'s is solved (Propositions 7.6 and 7.7) and a moduli space is constructed (Subsection 7.8).

Part I of the paper is concluded with Section 8 where the examples (1) – (3) from Theorem I are presented in more detail. The results of the preceeding section are applied to this case of 5-dimensional tube manifolds $M$. In particular Propositions 8.8 and 8.11 contain some additional information to that stated in Theorem I and also complete the proof of Theorem I.

Part II of the paper is mainly devoted to prove Theorem II. In the preliminary section 9 we explain how the geometric properties such as $k$-nondegeneracy, minimality or the CR-dimension of an arbitrary locally homogeneous CR-germ $(M, o)$ can be encoded in a pure Lie algebraic object, the associated CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$. This is the key for our classification and is based on results taken from [18]. Specified to 5-dimensional CR-germs, we formulate the precise algebraic conditions on a CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ ensuring that the associated CR-germ $(M, o)$ is 2-nondegenerate.

Once the classification of 2-nondegenerate 5-dimensional locally homogeneous CR-germs $(M, o)$ is reduced to a classification problem of certain CR-algebras, we begin in Section 10 to carry out the details of the proof. It is subdivided into several sections, lemmata and claims and will only be completed in Section 16. Our proof relies on a quite subtle analysis of Lie algebraic properties of CR-algebras and uses basic structure theory of Lie algebras and Lie groups. The methods are quite general and can be adapted to handle also higher dimensional cases.

A more detailed outline of the proof can be found in the first part of Section 10.

# PART 1: Levi degenerate CR-manifolds

## 2. Preliminaries

In the following let $E$ always be a complex vector space of finite dimension and $M \subset E$ an immersed connected real-analytic submanifold. In most cases $M$ will be locally closed in $E$. Due to the canonical identifications $T_aE = E$, for every $a \in M$ we consider the tangent space $T_aM$ as an $\mathbb{R}$-linear subspace of $E$. Then $H_aM := T_aM \cap iT_aM$ is the largest complex linear subspace of $E$ contained in $T_aM$. The manifold $M$ is called a *CR-submanifold* if $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} H_aM$ does not depend on $a \in M$. This dimension is called the *CR-dimension* of $M$ and $H_aM$ is called the *holomorphic tangent space* at $a$, compare [5] as general reference for CR-manifolds. Given a further real-analytic CR-submanifold $M'$ of a complex vector space $E'$, a smooth mapping $g : M \to M'$ is called *CR* if for every $a \in M$ the differential $dg_a : T_aM \to T_{ga}M'$ maps the corresponding holomorphic tangent spaces in a complex-linear way to each other. Keeping in mind the identification $T_aE = E$, a vector field on $M$ is a mapping $f : M \to E$ with $f(a) \in T_aM$ for all $a \in M$. For better distinction we also write $\xi = f(z)\partial/_{\partial z}$ instead of $f$ and $\xi_a$ instead of $f(a)$, compare the convention (2.1) in [19].

An *infinitesimal CR-transformation* on $M$ is by definition a real-analytic vector field $f(z)\partial/_{\partial z}$ on $M$ such that the corresponding local flow consists of CR-transformations. Let us denote by $\mathfrak{hol}(M)$ the space of all such vector fields, which is a real Lie algebra with respect to the usual bracket. For every $f(z)\partial/_{\partial z} \in \mathfrak{hol}(M)$ and every $a \in M$ there exist an open neighbourhood $U \subset M$ of $a$ with respect to the manifold topology on $M$, an open neighbourhood $W$ of $a$ with respect to $E$ and a holomorphic mapping $h : W \to E$ with $f(z) = h(z)$ for all $z \in U \cap W$, compare [2] or 12.4.22 in [5].

Further, for every $a \in M$ we denote by $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ the Lie algebra of all germs of infinitesimal CR-transformations defined on arbitrary open neighbourhoods of $a$ with respect to the manifold topology of $M$. For simplicity and without essential loss of generality we always assume that the CR-submanifold $M$ is *generic* in $E$, that is, $E = T_aM \oplus iT_aM$ for all $a \in M$. This assumption allows us to consider $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ in a canonical way as a real Lie subalgebra of the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(E, a)$, what we always do in the following. The CR-manifold $M$ is called *holomorphically nondegenerate* at $a$ if $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ is totally real in $\mathfrak{hol}(E, a)$, that is, if $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a) \cap i\ \mathfrak{hol}(M, a) = 0$ in $\mathfrak{hol}(E, a)$. This condition together with the minimality of $M$ at $a$ implies $\dim \mathfrak{hol}(M, a) < \infty$, see 12.5.3 in [5]. Here, the CR-submanifold $M \subset E$ is called *minimal* at $a \in M$ if $T_aR = T_aM$ for every submanifold $R \subset M$ with $a \in R$ and $H_zM \subset T_zR$ for all $z \in R$. By Proposition 15.5.1 in [5], $\dim \mathfrak{hol}(M, a) < \infty$ implies that $M$ is holomorphically nondegenerate at $a$. The CR-manifold $M$ is called *locally homogeneous* at the point $a \in M$ if there exists a Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ of finite dimension such that the canonical evaluation map $\mathfrak{g} \to T_aM$ is surjective. In case $M$ is locally homogeneous at $a$ the condition $\dim \mathfrak{hol}(M, a) < \infty$ is equivalent to $M$ being holomorphically nondegenerate and minimal at $a$.

By $\mathfrak{aut}(M, a) := \{\xi \in \mathfrak{hol}(M, a) : \xi_a = 0\}$ we denote the *isotropy subalgebra* at $a \in M$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{aut}(M, a)$ has finite codimension in $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ the group of all *germs* of real-analytic CR-isomorphisms $h : W \to \widetilde{W}$ with $h(a) = a$, where $W, \widetilde{W}$ are arbitrary open neighbourhoods of $a$ in $M$. It is known that every germ in $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ can be represented by a holomorphic map $U \to E$, where $U$ is an open neighbourhood of $a$ in $E$, compare e.g. 1.7.13 in [5]. Furthermore, $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ denotes the group of all global real-analytic CR-automorphisms $h : M \to M$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(M)_a$ its isotropy subgroup at $a$. There is a canonical group monomorphism $\mathrm{Aut}(M)_a \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ as well as an exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{aut}(M, a) \to \mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ for every $a \in M$.

By $\mathfrak{aff}(M) \subset \mathfrak{hol}(M)$ we denote the Lie subalgebra of all (complex) affine infinitesimal CR-transformations on $M$. For every $a \in M$ furthermore $\mathfrak{aff}(M, a) \subset \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ is the Lie subalgebra of all affine germs. The canonical embedding $\mathfrak{aff}(M) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$ is an isomorphism for every $a \in M$.

Suppose that $g\colon U \to U'$ is a biholomorphic mapping between open subsets $U, U' \subset E$. Then

$$g_*\big(f(z)\partial/_{\partial z}\big) = g'(g^{-1}z)\big(f(g^{-1}z)\big)\,\partial/_{\partial z} \tag{2.1}$$

defines a complex Lie algebra isomorphism $g_*\colon \mathfrak{hol}(U) \to \mathfrak{hol}(U')$, where $g'(u) \in \mathrm{End}(E)$ for every $u \in U$ is the derivative of $g$ at $u$. For real-analytic CR-submanifolds $M, M' \subset E$ every CR-isomorphism $g\colon (M,a) \to (M',a')$ of manifold germs induces a Lie algebra isomorphism $g_*\colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}'$, where $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ and $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{hol}(M',a')$. From (2.1) it is clear that $g_*$ extends to a complex Lie algebra isomorphism $\mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{l}'$, where the sums $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(E,a)$ and $\mathfrak{l}' := \mathfrak{g}' \oplus i\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{hol}(E,a')$ are not necessarily direct. In particular, $g \mapsto g_*$ defines a group homomorphism $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$.

A basic invariant of a CR-manifold is the (vector valued) *Levi form*. Its definitions found in the literature may differ by a constant factor. Here we choose the following one: It is well-known that for every point $a$ in the CR-manifold $M$ there is a well defined alternating $\mathbb{R}$-bilinear map

$$\omega_a : H_aM \times H_aM \;\to\; E/H_aM$$

satisfying $\omega_a(\xi_a, \zeta_a) \equiv [\xi, \zeta]_a \mod H_aM$, where $\xi, \zeta$ are arbitrary smooth vector fields on $M$ with $\xi_z, \zeta_z \in H_zM$ for all $z \in M$. We define the Levi form

$$\mathcal{L}_a : H_aM \times H_aM \;\to\; E/H_aM \tag{2.2}$$

to be twice the sesquilinear part of $\omega_a$. By *sesquilinear* we always mean 'conjugate linear in the first and complex linear in the second variable', that is,

$$\mathcal{L}_a(v,w) = \omega_a(v,w) + i\omega_a(iv,w) \qquad \text{for all } v, w \in H_aM\,.$$

In particular, the vectors $\mathcal{L}_a(v,v)$, $v \in H_aM$, are contained in $iT_aM/H_aM$, which can be identified in a canonical way with the normal space $E/T_aM$ to $M \subset E$ at $a$. The following remark follows immediately from the way the Levi form is defined:

**2.3 Remark.** Suppose $Z$ is a complex manifold, $\varphi : Z \to M$ is a smooth CR-mapping and $a = \varphi(c)$ for some $c \in Z$. Then every vector $v \in d\varphi_c(T_cZ) \subset H_aM$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}_a(v,v) = 0$. In general, $v$ is not contained in the *Levi kernel*

$$K_aM := \{v \in H_aM : \mathcal{L}_a(v,w) = 0 \;\text{ for all }\; w \in H_aM\}\,.$$

The CR-manifold $M$ is called *Levi nondegenerate* at $a$ if $K_aM = 0$. Generalizing that, the notion of $k$-*nondegeneracy* for $M$ at $a$ has been introduced for every integer $k \geq 1$ (see [6], [5]). As shown in 11.5.1 of [5] a real-analytic and connected CR-manifold $M$ is holomorphically nondegenerate at $a$ (equivalently: at every $z \in M$) if and only if there exists a $k \geq 1$ such that $M$ is $k$-nondegenerate at some point $b \in M$. For $k = 1$ this notion is equivalent to $M$ being Levi nondegenerate at $b \in M$.

In the second part of our paper we also need a more general notion of a (real-analytic) CR-manifold. This is a connected real-analytic manifold $M$ together with a subbundle $HM \subset TM$ (called the 'holomorphic subbundle') and a bundle endomorphism $J$ of $HM$ with $J^2 = -\mathrm{id}$ such that $(HM, J)$ is involutive, compare 7.4 in [8]. By a theorem in [1] there exists an embedding $M \hookrightarrow Z$ into a complex manifold $Z$, such that $H_zM$ corresponds to $T_zM \cap iT_zM$, where $T_zZ \to T_zZ$ is simply the multiplication with the imaginary unit $i$ (here the real-analyticity is necessary). The bundle homomorphism $J : HM \to HM$ is then the restriction of that multiplication with $i$ to $H_zM$ for every $z \in M$. For local considerations one can always assume that $Z$ is (an open subset of) $\mathbb{C}^n$.

## 3. Tube manifolds

Let $V$ be a real vector space of finite dimension and $E := V \oplus iV$ its complexification. Let furthermore $F \subset V$ be a connected real-analytic submanifold and $M := F + iV \subset E$ the corresponding *tube manifold*. $M$ is a generic CR-submanifold of $E$, invariant under all translations $z \mapsto z + iv$, $v \in V$. In case $V'$ is another real vector space of finite dimension, $E'$ its complexification, $F' \subset V'$ a real-analytic submanifold and $\varphi : V \to V'$ an affine mapping with $\varphi(F) \subset F'$, then clearly $\varphi$ extends in a unique way to a complex-affine mapping $E \to E'$ with $\varphi(M) \subset M'$. However, it should be noted that higher order real-analytic maps $\psi : F \to F'$ also extend locally to holomorphic maps $\psi : U \to E'$, $U$ open in $E$. But in contrast to the affine case we have in general $\psi(M \cap U) \not\subset M'$. We may therefore ask how the CR-structure of $M$ is related to the real affine structure of the submanifold $F \subset V$.

For every $a \in F$ let $T_aF \subset V$ be the *tangent space* and $N_aF := V/T_aF$ the *normal space* to $F$ at $a$. Then $T_aM = T_aF \oplus iV$ for the corresponding tube manifold $M$, and $N_aF$ can be canonically identified with the normal space $N_aM = E/T_aM$ of $M$ in $E$. Define the map $\ell_a : T_aF \times T_aF \to N_aF$ in the following way: For $v, w \in T_aF$ choose a smooth map $f : V \to V$ with $f(a) = v$ and $f(x) \in T_xF$ for all $x \in F$ (actually it suffices to choose such an $f$ only in a small neighborhood of $a$ ). Then put

$$\ell_a(v, w) := f'(a)(w) \mod T_aF\,, \tag{3.1}$$

where the linear operator $f'(a) \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ is the derivative of $f$ at $a$. One shows that $\ell_a$ does not depend on the choice of $f$ and is a symmetric bilinear map. We mention that if $V$ is provided with a flat Riemannian metric and $N_aF$ is identified with $T_aF^{\perp}$ then $\ell$ is nothing but the second fundamental form of $F$ (see the subsection II.3.3 in [32]). The form $\ell_a$ can also be read off from local equations for $F$, more precisely, suppose that $U \subset V$ is an open subset, $W$ is a real vector space and $h : U \to W$ is a real-analytic submersion with $F = h^{-1}(0)$. Then the derivative $h'(a) : V \to W$ induces a linear isomorphism $N_aF \cong W$ and modulo this identification $\ell_a$ is nothing but the second derivative $h''(a) : V \times V \to W$ at $a$, restricted to $T_aF \times T_aF$. By

$$K_aF := \{w \in T_aF : \ell_a(v, w) = 0 \text{ for all } v \in T_aF\}$$

we denote the *kernel* of $\ell_a$. The manifold $F$ is called (affinely) *nondegenerate* at $a$ if $K_aF = 0$ holds. The following statement follows directly from the definition of $\ell_a$:

**3.2 Lemma.** *Suppose that* $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ *satisfies* $\varphi(x) \in T_xF$ *for all* $x \in F$. *Then* $\varphi(a) \in K_aF$ *if and only if* $\varphi\big(T_aF\big) \subset T_aF$.

Lemma 3.2 applies in particular for $\varphi = \mathrm{id}$ in case $F$ is a *cone*, that is, $rF = F$ for all real $r > 0$. More generally, we call the submanifold $F \subset V$ *conical* if $x \in T_xF$ for all $x \in F$. Then $\mathbb{R}a \subset K_aF$ holds for all $a \in F$.

In the remaining part of this section we explain how the CR-structure of the tube manifold $M$ is related to the real objects $\ell_a$, $TF$, $KF$ and $K^rF$, to be defined below, which depend only on the affine geometry of $F$. In general it needs some effort to check whether a given CR-manifold $M$ is $k$-nondegenerate at a point $a \in M$ (in sense of [4]). For affinely homogeneous tube manifolds, however, there are simple criteria, see Propositions 3.5 and 3.7. We start with some preparations. For every $a \in F \subset M$

$$H_aM = T_aF \oplus iT_aF \,\subset\, E \tag{3.3}$$

is the holomorphic tangent space at $a$, and $E/H_aM$ can be canonically identified with $N_aF \oplus iN_aF$. It is easily seen that the Levi form $\mathcal{L}_a$ of $M$ at $a$, compare (2.2), is nothing but the sesquilinear extension of the form $\ell_a$ from $T_aF \times T_aF$ to $H_aM \times H_aM$. In particular,

$$K_aM = K_aF \oplus iK_aF$$

is the *Levi kernel* of $M$ at $a$. In case the dimension of $K_aF$ does not depend on $a \in F$ these spaces form a subbundle $KF \subset TF$. In that case to every $v \in K_aF$ there exists a smooth function $f : V \to V$ with $f(a) = v$ and $f(x) \in K_xF$ for all $x \in F$, i.e., the tangent vector $v$ extends to a smooth section in $KF$. In any case, let us define inductively linear subspaces $K_a^rF$ of $T_aF$ as follows:

**3.4 Definition.** For every real-analytic submanifold $F \subset V$, every $a \in F$ and every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ put

(i) $K^0_aF := T_aF$ and define

(ii) $K^{r+1}_aF$ to be the space of all vectors $v \in K^r_aF$ such that there is a smooth mapping $f : V \to V$ with $f'(a)(T_aF) \subset K^r_aF$, $f(a) = v$ and $f(x) \in K^r_xF$ for all $x \in F$.

It is clear that $K^1_aF = K_aF$ holds. Let us call $F$ of *uniform degeneracy* or *uniformly degenerate* if for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ the dimension of $K^r_aF$ does not depend on $a \in F$. In that case it can be shown that for every $v \in K^r_aF$ the outcome of the condition $f'(a)(T_aF) \subset K^r_aF$ in (ii) does not depend on the choice of the smooth mapping $f : V \to V$ satisfying $f(a) = v$ and $f(x) \in K^r_xF$ for all $x \in F$. For instance, $F$ is of uniform degeneracy if $F$ is locally affinely homogeneous, that is, if there exists a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$ of affine vector fields on $V$ such that every $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}$ is tangent to $F$ and such that the canonical evaluation map $\mathfrak{a} \to T_aF$ is surjective for every $a \in F$. Clearly, if $F$ is locally affinely homogeneous in the above sense then the corresponding tube manifold $M = F + iV$ is locally homogeneous as CR-manifold.

Recall our convention that every smooth map $f : V \to V$ is considered as the smooth vector field $\xi = f(x)\partial/\partial x$ on $V$. Our computations below are considerably simplified by the obvious fact that every smooth vector field $\xi$ on V has a unique smooth extension to $E$ that is invariant under all translations $z \mapsto z + iv$, $v \in V$. In case $\xi$ is tangent to $F \subset V$ the extension satisfies $\xi_z \in H_zM$ for all $z \in M$.

In case the submanifold $F \subset V$ is uniformly degenerate in a neighbourhood of $a \in F$ we call $F$ *affinely $k$-nondegenerate* at $a$ if $K^k_aF = 0$ and $k$ is minimal with respect to this property. It can be seen that 'affine $k$-nondegeneracy' is invariant under affine coordinate changes. As a consequence of [26], compare the last 5 lines in the Appendix therein, we state:

**3.5 Proposition.** *Suppose that $F$ is uniformly degenerate in a neighbourhood of $a \in F$. Then the corresponding tube manifold $M = F + iV$ is $k$-nondegenerate as CR-manifold at $a \in M$ if and only if $F$ is affinely $k$-nondegenerate at $a$.*

**3.6 Corollary.** *Suppose* $\dim F \geq 2$ *and $K_xF = \mathbb{R}x$ for all $x \in F$. Then $F$ is affinely 2-nondegenerate at every point.*

*Proof.* The map $f = \mathrm{id}$ has the property $f(x) \in K_xF$ for every $x \in F$. Hence, the relation $f'(x)(T_xF) = T_xF \not\subset K_xF$ implies $x \notin K^2_xF$ and thus $K^2_xF = 0$ as well as $x \neq 0$. In particular, $F$ is uniformly degenerate. ☐

For locally affinely homogeneous submanifolds $F \subset V$ the spaces $K^r_aF$ can easily be characterized. For each affine vector field $\xi = h(x)\partial/\partial x$ on $V$ denote by $\xi^{\mathrm{lin}} := h - h(0) \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ the *linear part* of $\xi$.

**3.7 Proposition.** *Suppose that $\mathfrak{A}$ is a linear space of affine vector fields on $V$ such that every $\xi \in \mathfrak{A}$ is tangent to $F$ and the canonical evaluation mapping $\mathfrak{A} \to T_aF$ is a linear isomorphism. Then, given any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the vector $v \in K^r_aF$ is in $K^{r+1}_aF$ if and only if $\xi^{\mathrm{lin}}(v) \in K^r_aF$ for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{A}$.*

*Proof.* By the implicit function theorem, there exist open neighbourhoods $Y$ of $0 \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $X$ of $a \in M$ such that $g(y) := \exp(y)a$ defines a diffeomorphism $g : Y \to X$. Define the smooth map $f : X \to V$ by $f(x) = \mu_y(v)$, where $\mu_y$ for $y := g^{-1}(x)$ is the linear part of the affine transformation $\exp(y)$. Then $f(a) = v$ and $f(x) \in K^r_xF$ for every $x \in X$. A simple computation shows that

$$f'(a)\big(g'(0)\xi\big) = \xi^{\mathrm{lin}}(v) \quad \text{for every} \quad \xi \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

In view of Definition 3.4.ii this identity implies the claim. ☐

It is easily seen that a necessary condition for $M$ being minimal as CR-manifold is that $F$ is not contained in an affine hyperplane of $V$. For later use in Proposition 4.10 we state the following sufficient condition.

**3.8 Proposition.** *Suppose that* $\mathfrak{A}$ *has the same properties as in Proposition* 3.7 *and denote by* $\Lambda \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ *the* associative *real subalgebra generated by* $\{\xi^{\mathrm{lin}} : \xi \in \mathfrak{A}\}$. *Then the tube manifold* $M = F+iV$ *is minimal at* $a$ *if* $V$ *is the linear span of all vectors* $\lambda(v)$ *with* $v \in T_aF$ *and* $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we assume that the canonical evaluation mapping $\mathfrak{A} \to T_xF$ is a linear isomorphism for every $x \in F$. We also assume that $V$ is the linear span of all $\lambda(v)$ as above. Define inductively for every integer $r \geq 1$ the subbundle $H^rM \subset TM$ in the following way: $H^1M := HM$ and every $H^{r+1}_zM$, $z \in M$, is the linear span of $H^r_zM$ together with all vectors $[\xi,\eta]_z$, where $\xi,\eta$ are arbitrary smooth sections in $H^rM$ over $M$. For the proof it is enough to show $T_aM = H^\infty_aM := \bigcup_{r\geq1}T_aM$.
From $T_aF \oplus iT_aF \subset H^r_aM \subset T_aF \oplus iV$ we see that for every $1 \leq r \leq \infty$ there is a unique linear subspace $H^r_aF \subset V$ with $H^r_aM = T_aF \oplus iH^r_aF$ and $H^1_aF = T_aF$. Therefore it is enough to show $H^\infty_aF = V$. We claim that $\xi^{\mathrm{lin}}(H^r_aF) \subset H^{r+1}_aF$ holds for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{A}$. To see this fix an arbitrary $w \in H^r_aF$ and an arbitrary vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{A}$. Choose a smooth section $\eta$ over $F$ in the bundle $iH^r_aF$ with $\eta_a = iw$ and extend $\eta$ as well as $\xi$ in the unique way to smooth vector fields on $M$ that are invariant under all translations $z \mapsto z + iv$ with $v \in V$. Then $\xi,\eta$ are sections in $H^rM$, and $[\xi,\eta]_a = i\xi^{\mathrm{lin}}(w) \in H^{r+1}_aM$ implies $\xi^{\mathrm{lin}}(w) \in H^{r+1}_aF$ as required. Now define inductively the linear subspaces $W^r \subset V$ by $W^1 := H^1_aF = T_aF$ and $W^{r+1}$ as the linear span of $W^r$ together with all $\xi^{\mathrm{lin}}(W^r)$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then $V = \bigcup_{r\geq1} W^r$ by assumption and $W^r \subset H^r_aF$ by induction gives $V \subset H^\infty_aM \subset V$ as desired. □

**3.9 Lemma.** *Suppose that* $F \subset V$ *is a submanifold such that for every* $c \in V$ *with* $c \neq 0$ *there exists a linear transformation* $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ *with* $g(F) = F$ *and* $g(c) \neq c$ *(this condition is automatically satisfied if* $F$ *is a cone). Then for* $M = F + iV$ *the CR-automorphism group* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *has trivial center.*

*Proof.* Let an element in the center of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ be given and let $h : U \to E$ be its holomorphic extension to an appropriate connected open neighbourhood $U$ of $M$. Since $h$ commutes with every translation $z \mapsto z+iv$, $v \in V$, it is a translation itself: Indeed, for $a \in F$ fixed and $c := h(a)-a$ the translation $\tau(z) := z+c$ coincides with $h$ on $a + iV$ and hence on $U$ by the identity principle. For every $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) \cap \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ the identity $gh = hg$ implies $g(c) = c$. This forces $c = 0$ by our assumption, that is, $h(z) \equiv z$. □

**3.10 Proposition.** *Suppose that the homogeneous CR-manifold* $M$ *is simply connected and that* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *has trivial center. In case the stability group* $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ *is trivial for some (and hence every)* $a \in M$, *the following properties hold:*

- (i) *Let* $M'$ *be an arbitrary homogeneous CR-manifold and* $D \subset M$, $D' \subset M'$ *non-empty domains. Then every real-analytic CR-isomorphism* $h : D \to D'$ *extends to a real-analytic CR-isomorphism* $M \to M'$.
- (ii) *Let* $M'$ *be an arbitrary locally homogeneous CR-manifold and* $D' \subset M'$ *a domain that is CR-equivalent to* $M$. *Then* $D' = M'$.

*Proof.* ad (i): Fix a point $a \in D$. To every $g \in G := \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ with $g(a) \in D$ there exists a transformation $g' \in G' := \mathrm{Aut}(M')$ with $hg(a) = g'h(a)$. Because of $\mathrm{Aut}(M',a') = \{\mathrm{id}\}$ the transformation $g'$ is uniquely determined by $g$ and satisfies $hg = g'h$ in a neighbourhood of $a$. Since the Lie group $G$ is simply connected $g \mapsto g'$ extends to a group homomorphism $G \to G'$ and $h$ extends to a CR-covering map $h : M \to M'$. The deck transformation group $\Gamma := \{g \in G : gh = h\}$ is in the center of $G$ and hence is trivial by assumption. Therefore, $h : M \to M'$ is a CR-isomorphism.
ad (ii): The proof is essentially the same as for Proposition 6.3 in [19]. □

The condition ‘locally homogeneous’ in Proposition 3.10.ii cannot be omitted. A counterexample is given for every integer $k \geq 3$ by the tube $M' \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ over the cone

$$F' := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_2^k = x_1^{k-1}x_3,\ x_1^2 + x_2^2 > 0\}\,.$$

Then with $\mathbb{R}^+ := e^{\mathbb{R}}$ the tube $M$ over $F := F' \cap (\mathbb{R}^+)^3$ is the Example 8.4 below for $\theta = k$, and $M, M'$ satisfy for $D' = M$ the assumption of Proposition 3.10.ii.

## 4. Tube manifolds over cones

In this section we always assume that the submanifold $F \subset V$ is conical (that is, $x \in T_xF$ for every $x \in F$) and that $a \in F$ is a given point. Then, for $M := F + iV$, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ contains the Euler vector field $\delta := z\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z}$. Denote by $\mathfrak{P}$ the complex Lie algebra of all polynomial holomorphic vector fields $f(z)\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z}$ on $E$, that is, $f : E \to E$ is a polynomial map. Then $\mathfrak{P}$ has the $\mathbb{Z}$-grading

$$\mathfrak{P} = \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{P}_k\,, \qquad [\mathfrak{P}_k, \mathfrak{P}_l] \subset \mathfrak{P}_{k+l}\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathfrak{P}_k$ is the $k$-eigenspace of $\operatorname{ad}(\delta)$ in $\mathfrak{P}$. Then $\mathfrak{P}_k$ is the subspace of all $(k + 1)$-homogeneous vector fields in $\mathfrak{P}$ if $k \geq -1$ and is 0 otherwise. Define $\mathfrak{g}_k := \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{P}_k$. Clearly, $\bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_k$ is a graded, in general proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\mathfrak{aff}(M, a) = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0$.

**4.2 Proposition.** *Retaining the above notation, suppose that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ has finite dimension. Then*

(i) $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{P}$, *that is, every $f(z)\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z} \in \mathfrak{g}$ is a polynomial vector field on $E = V \oplus iV$. Furthermore, $f(iV) \subset iV$.*

(ii) $\displaystyle \mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{k\geq -1} \mathfrak{g}_k\,, \quad [\mathfrak{g}_k, \mathfrak{g}_l] \subset \mathfrak{g}_{k+l} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{g}_{-1} = \{iv\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z} : v \in V\}\,.$

(iii) *For every $z \in M$ the canonical map $\mathfrak{hol}(M) \to \mathfrak{hol}(M, z)$ is a Lie algebra isomorphism.*

(iv) $\mathfrak{g}_k = 0$ *for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $\mathfrak{g}_j = 0$ for every $j \geq k$.*

*Proof.* Consider $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(E, a)$, which contains the vector field $\eta := (z - a)\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z}$. We first show $\mathfrak{l} \subset \mathfrak{P}$: Fix an arbitrary $\xi := f(z)\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z} \in \mathfrak{l}$. Then in a certain neighbourhood of $a \in E$ there exists a unique expansion $\xi = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \xi_k$, where $\xi_k = p_k(z-a)\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z}$ for a $k$-homogeneous polynomial map $p_k : E \to E$. It is easily verified that the vector field $\operatorname{ad}(\eta)\xi \in \mathfrak{l}$ has the expansion $\operatorname{ad}(\eta)\xi = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(k-1)\xi_k$. Now assume that for $d := \dim \mathfrak{l}$ there exist indices $k_0 < k_1 < \ldots < k_d$ such that $\xi_{k_l} \neq 0$ for $0 \leq l \leq d$. Since the Vandermonde matrix $\big((k_l - 1)^j\big)$ in non-singular, we get that the vector fields $(\operatorname{ad}\eta)^j\xi = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(k-1)^j\xi_k$, $0 \leq j \leq d$, are linearly independent in $\mathfrak{l}$, a contradiction. This implies $\xi \in \mathfrak{P}$ as claimed.
Since $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ has finite dimension, every $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}$ is a finite sum $\eta = \sum_{k=-1}^{m} \eta_k$ with $\eta_k \in \mathfrak{P}_k$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ not depending on $\eta$. For every polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ then $p(\operatorname{ad}\delta)\eta = \sum_{k=-1}^{m} p(k)\eta_k$ shows $\eta_k \in \mathfrak{g}_k$ for all $k$, that is, $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus \mathfrak{g}_k$. The identity $\mathfrak{g}_{-1} = \{iv\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z} : v \in V\}$ follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{g}_{-1}$ is totally real in $\mathfrak{P}_{-1}$and this implies $f(iV) \subset iV$ for all $f(z)\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z} \in \mathfrak{g}_k$ by $[\mathfrak{g}_{-1}, \mathfrak{g}_k] \subset \mathfrak{g}_{k-1}$ and induction on $k$. For the proof of the last claim assume $\mathfrak{g}_k = 0$ for some $k \geq 0$. Then $[\mathfrak{P}_{-1}, \mathfrak{g}_{k+1}] \subset (\mathfrak{g}_k \oplus i\mathfrak{g}_k) = 0$ implies $\mathfrak{g}_{k+1} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$ and hence $\mathfrak{g}_{k+1} = 0$. □

**4.3 Corollary.** *In case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ has finite dimension the CR-manifold $M = F + iV$ is locally homogeneous at $a$ if and only if $F$ is locally linearly homogeneous at $a \in F$.*

*Proof.* From Proposition 4.2 follows that $W := \{\xi_a : \xi \in \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{g}_{2k}\}$ is a subspace of $V$ while $\{\xi_a : \xi \in \bigoplus_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{g}_{2k-1}\} = iV$. Hence, $M$ is locally homogeneous at $a$ if and only if $W = T_aF$. But for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_{2k}$ the vector field $\eta := (\operatorname{ad} ia\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z})^{2k}\xi$ is in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ and satisfies $\eta_a = (-1)^k(2k + 1)!\,\xi_a$, that is, $W = \{\xi_a : \xi \in \mathfrak{g}_0\}$. □

Notice that the conclusion $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ together with an eigenspace decomposition as in Proposition 4.2 can for $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ be obtained in the same way if instead of '$F$ conical' it is only assumed for $M = F + i\mathbb{R}^n$ that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ contains a vector field $\alpha_1 z_1\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z_1} + \alpha_2 z_2\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z_2} + \ldots + \alpha_n z_n\,{}^{\partial}\!/_{\partial z_n}$ with $\alpha_k > 0$ for all $k$, compare e.g. (7.13).

**4.4 Proposition.** *Assume that $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ has finite dimension and that $F' \subset V$ is a further conical submanifold with tube manifold $M' = F' + iV$ and $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{hol}(M', a')$ for some $a' \in F'$. Assume that the CR-germs $(M, a)$ and $(M', a')$ are isomorphic and let $g, \widetilde{g} : (M, a) \to (M', a')$ be arbitrary CR-isomorphisms. Then*

(i) $\dim \mathfrak{g}_k = \dim \mathfrak{g}'_k$ *for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathfrak{g}_k, \mathfrak{g}'_k$ are given by the decomposition 4.2.ii.*

(ii) *$g$ is represented by a rational transformation on $E$.*

(iii) *In case* $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$, $g$ *is represented by a linear transformation in* $\mathrm{GL}(V) \subset \mathrm{GL}(E)$ *mapping every* $K^r_a F$ *onto* $K^r_{a'} F'$.

(iv) $g = \widetilde{g}$ *if and only if* $g, \widetilde{g}$ *have the same* $d$*-jet at* $a$, *where* $d := \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \mathfrak{g}_k = 0\}$.

*Proof.* Let $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{l}_k := \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{P}_k$ for all $k$. The Lie algebra automorphism $\Psi := \exp(\operatorname{ad} a\,\partial/\partial z)$ of $\mathfrak{l}$ maps every $f(z)\partial/\partial z$ to $f(z+a)\partial/\partial z$. For every $k$ denote by $\mathfrak{l}^k \subset \mathfrak{l}$ the subspace of all vector fields that vanish of order at least $k{+}1$ at $a$. Then $\Psi(\mathfrak{l}^k) = \bigoplus_{j \geq k} \mathfrak{l}_j$ implies $\dim \mathfrak{l}_k = \dim \mathfrak{l}^k/\mathfrak{l}^{k+1}$. As a consequence, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{g}_k = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{l}_k$ is a CR-invariant of the germ $(M, a)$ for every $k$.

For the proof of (ii), (iii) put $\mathfrak{l}' := \mathfrak{g}' + i\mathfrak{g}'$ and extend $g$ to a biholomorphic mapping $g : U \to U'$ with $g(a) = a'$ and $g(U \cap M) = U' \cap M'$ for suitable connected open neighbourhoods $U, U'$ of $a, a' \in E$. Consider the induced Lie algebra isomorphism $g_* : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{l}'$, compare (2.1). Its inverse $\Theta := g_*^{-1}$ is given by

$$\Theta\big(f(z)\partial/\partial z\big) = g'(z)^{-1} f\big(g(z)\big)\,\partial/\partial z\,. \tag{4.5}$$

Since $\mathfrak{l}$ consists of polynomial vector fields (Proposition 4.2) there exist *polynomial* maps $p : E \to E$ and $q : E \to \mathrm{End}(E)$ such that

$$\Theta\big(z\partial/\partial z\big) = p(z)\partial/\partial z \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta\big(e\partial/\partial z\big) = \big(q(z)e\big)\,\partial/\partial z$$

for all $e \in E$. Then (4.5) implies $g'(z)^{-1} = q(z)$ and $g'(z)^{-1}g(z) = p(z)$, that is,

$$g(z) = q(z)^{-1}p(z) \tag{4.6}$$

in a neighbourhood of $a \in E$ and, in particular, $g$ is rational.

Now suppose $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$. Then also $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{g}'_k = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$ by 4.2.iv and (i). Clearly $\Theta(\mathfrak{l}'_{a'}) = \mathfrak{l}_a$, where $\mathfrak{l}_a := \{\xi \in \mathfrak{l} : \xi_a = 0\}$ and similarly $\mathfrak{l}'_{a'} \subset \mathfrak{l}'$ are the isotropy subalgebras at $a, a'$. Also, $\delta_a := (z-a)\partial/\partial z$ is the unique element in $\mathfrak{l}_a$ such that $\operatorname{ad}(\delta_a)$ induces the negative identity on the factor space $\mathfrak{l}/\mathfrak{l}_a$. Since $\delta_{a'}$ has the same uniqueness property for $\mathfrak{l}'_{a'}$ we must have $\Theta(\delta_{a'}) = \delta_a$. Since $\delta = z\partial/\partial z$ is the $\mathfrak{g}$-component of $\delta_a$ as well as of $\delta_{a'}$ in $\mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ we actually get $\Theta(\delta) = \delta$, that is, $p(z) \equiv z$. Also $\mathfrak{l}_{-1}$ is $\Theta$-invariant, implying that $q$ is constant. Therefore $g = q(a)^{-1}$.

For the proof of (iv) we assume without loss of generality that $M = M'$, $a = a'$ and that $g, \mathrm{id} \in \mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ have the same $d$-jet at $a$. This implies that $(g(z) - z)$ vanishes of order $> d$ and $(g'(z) - \mathrm{id})$ vanishes of order $\geq d$ at $a$. Therefore also $(g'(z)^{-1} - \mathrm{id}) = (q(z) - \mathrm{id})$ vanishes of order $\geq d$ at $a$. Since $q$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq d$, there is a $d$-homogeneous polynomial $s : E \to \mathrm{End}(V)$ with $q(z) = \mathrm{id} + s(z-a)$. Consider the vector field $\eta := (z-a)\partial/\partial z \in \mathfrak{l}$ and define the holomorphic mappings $h, r : U \to E$ by

$$h(z) := q(z)\big(g(z) - a\big) = (z - a) + r(z)\,.$$

Then $\Theta\big(\eta\big) = h(z)\partial/\partial z \in \mathfrak{g}$ shows that $h$ and $r$ are polynomials of degree $\leq d$. But

$$r(z) = \big(g(z) - z\big) + s(z-a)\big(g(z) - a\big)$$

vanishes of order $> d$ at $a$, that is, $r = 0$ and $\Theta(\eta) = \eta$. This implies $\Theta(\mathfrak{l}_{-1}) = \mathfrak{l}_{-1}$ since $\mathfrak{l}_{-1}$ is the $(-1)$-eigenspace of $\operatorname{ad}(\eta)$. Therefore $g$ is an affine transformation on $E$. From $g(a) = a$ and $g'(a) = \mathrm{id}$ we finally get $g = \mathrm{id}$. □

**4.7 Corollary.** *Let* $M := F + iV$, $M' := F' + iV$ *with conical submanifolds* $F, F' \subset V$ *and let* $a \in F$, $a' \in F'$ *be arbitrary points. Assume furthermore that* $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a) = \mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$ *holds. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *The manifold germs* $(M, a)$, $(M', a')$ *are CR-equivalent.*

(ii) *The manifold germs* $(M, a)$, $(M', a')$ *are affinely equivalent.*

(iii) *The manifold germs* $(F, a)$, $(F', a')$ *are linearly equivalent.*

Recall that $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) \subset \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ is defined as the isotropy subalgebra at $a$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ is the CR-automorphism group of the manifold germ $(M,a)$, also called the *stability group* at $a \in M$.

**4.8 Proposition.** *Let $F \subset V$ be conical and $M = F + iV$. In case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ has finite dimension, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$.
(ii) $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{aff}(M,a)$.
(iii) *The tangential representation $g \mapsto g'(a)$ induces a group monomorphism* $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$.

*Each of these conditions is satisfied if $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) = 0$.*

*Proof.* Let $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(E,a)$ and $\mathfrak{l}_k := \mathfrak{g}_k \oplus i\mathfrak{g}_k$ for all $k$.
(i) ⇒ (ii) Follows from the last claim in Proposition 4.2.
(ii) ⇒ (iii) By Proposition 4.4.iii every $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ is represented by a linear transformation on $V$.
(iii) ⇒ (i) Let $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ be an arbitrary vector field. Then there exists a unique symmetric bilinear map $b : E \times E \to E$ with $\xi = b(z,z)\partial/\partial z$. Now $(\mathrm{ad}\, ia\partial/\partial z)^2\xi = -2b(a,a)\partial/\partial z \in \mathfrak{g}$, that is, $\eta := h(z)\partial/\partial z$ is in $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a)$, where $h(z) := b(z,z) - b(a,a)$. For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ therefore the transformation $\psi_t := \exp(t\eta) \in \mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ has derivative $\psi_t'(a) = \exp(th'(a)) \in \mathrm{GL}(E)$ in $a$. But $\psi_t'(a) \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ by 4.4.iii and thus $2b(a,v) = h'(a)v \in V$ for all $v \in V$. On the other hand $b(a,v) \in iV$ by Lemma 3.9, implying $\psi_t'(a) = \mathrm{id}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By the injectivity of the tangential representation therefore $\eta_t$ does not depend on $t$ and we get $\xi = 0$. This proves (i) and thus the equivalence of (i) – (iii).
Suppose $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) = 0$ and that there exists a non-zero vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_1$. Then $\xi_a \in iV$ and there exists an $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$ with $\xi - \eta \in \mathfrak{aut}(M,a)$, a contradiction. □

**4.9 Remark.** Notice that the condition (iii) in Proposition 4.8 states that the tangential representation takes its values in the subgroup $\mathrm{GL}(V) \subset \mathrm{GL}(E)$. In general, the tangential representation is not injective and also takes values outside $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. The tube $\mathcal{M}$ over the future light cone can serve as a counterexample for both of these phenomena.

**4.10 Proposition.** *Suppose that $M = F + iV$, $F \subset V$ a conical submanifold, is locally homogeneous and that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_0$ for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$. Then the tangential representation at $a$ induces a group isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(M,a) \;\cong\; \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) : g\mathfrak{g}_0 g^{-1} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \;\text{ and }\; g(a) = a\}\,,$$

*where $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is considered in the canonical way as linear subspace of* $\mathrm{End}(V)$.

*Proof.* The assumptions imply that $H(a) \cap F$ is a neighbourhood of $a$ in $F$ for $H := \exp(\mathfrak{g}_0) \subset \mathrm{GL}(V)$. Let $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ be an arbitrary linear transformation with $g(a) = a$ and $g\mathfrak{g}_0 g^{-1} = \mathfrak{g}_0$. Then $gHg^{-1} = H$ and hence $gH(a) = Hg(a) = H(a)$, that is $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$. Conversely, by 4.4.iii every element of $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ can be represented by some $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ with $g(a) = a$. The Lie algebra automorphism $\Theta = g_*$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ leaves $\delta$ and thus also $\mathfrak{g}_0$ invariant. As a consequence, $\Theta(\varphi) = g\varphi g^{-1}$ for every $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}_0$, that is, $g\mathfrak{g}_0 g^{-1} = \mathfrak{g}_0$. □

The real Lie algebra structure of $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ is a CR-invariant for the manifold germ $(M,a)$. For certain classes of conical tube manifolds this gives a complete invariant:

**4.11 Proposition.** *Let $F, F' \subset V$ be conical submanifolds for which the corresponding tubes $M := F + iV$, $M' := F' + iV$ are locally homogeneous CR-manifolds. Let $a \in F$, $a' \in F'$ be arbitrary points and assume that for $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$ the spaces $\mathfrak{g}_k$ occurring in the gradation 4.2.ii satisfy $\mathfrak{g}_k = [\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0] = 0$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *The germs $(M,a)$, $(M',a')$ are CR-equivalent.*
(ii) $\mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$, $\mathfrak{hol}(M',a')$ *are isomorphic as real Lie algebras.*

*Proof.* Only the implication (ii) ⇒ (i) is not obvious. Suppose that $\Theta : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{hol}(M',a')$ is a Lie algebra isomorphism. We use the same symbol for the complex linear extension $\Theta : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{l}'$.
Our first step is to show that $\Theta$ can be modified in such a way that it respects the gradations. To begin with, $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ is abelian since our assumption implies that $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$ has this property. With $\mathfrak{g}' = \bigoplus \mathfrak{g}_k'$

being the gradation for $\mathfrak{g}'$ as in 4.2.ii assume that there exists a minimal integer $k \geq 1$ with $\mathfrak{g}'_k \neq 0$. Then $\mathfrak{g}'_{-1} = [\delta, \mathfrak{g}'_{-1}]$ and $\mathfrak{c} := [\mathfrak{g}'_{-1}, \mathfrak{g}'_k] \neq 0$ imply $\mathfrak{g}'_{-1}, \mathfrak{c} \subset [\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ together with $[\mathfrak{g}'_{-1}, \mathfrak{c}] \neq 0$, a contradiction. Therefore $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}'_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}'_0$ with $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}'] = \mathfrak{g}'_{-1}$, and as a consequence, $\Theta(\mathfrak{g}_{-1}) = \Theta([\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]) = [\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}'] = \mathfrak{g}'_{-1}$. Since $\mathrm{ad} : \mathfrak{g}'_0 \to \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}'_{-1})$ is injective, $\delta + \mathfrak{g}'_{-1}$ is precisely the set of all $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}'$ such that $\mathrm{ad}\,\xi$ induces on $\mathfrak{g}'_{-1}$ the negative identity. Therefore, there exists $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}'_{-1}$ with $\Theta(\delta) = \delta - \eta$. Replacing $\Theta$ by $\exp(\mathrm{ad}\,\eta)\Theta = (\mathrm{id} + \mathrm{ad}\,\eta)\Theta$, we get $\Theta(\delta) = \delta$ and finally $\Theta(\mathfrak{g}_k) = \mathfrak{g}'_k$ for all $k$.
There exists a linear operator $\theta \in \mathrm{GL}(V) \subset \mathrm{GL}(E)$ with $\Theta(e\,\partial/\partial z) = \theta(e)\,\partial/\partial z$ for all $e \in E = V \oplus iV$. We claim that $H' = \theta H \theta^{-1}$ holds for the abelian subgroups $H := \exp \mathfrak{g}_0$ and $H' := \exp \mathfrak{g}'_0$ of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. Indeed, application of $\Theta$ to $\big[e\,\partial/\partial z, \lambda(z)\,\partial/\partial z\big] = \lambda(e)\,\partial/\partial z$ yields

$$\widetilde{\lambda}\theta = \theta\lambda \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda(z)\,\partial/\partial z \in \mathfrak{g}_0 \text{ and } \widetilde{\lambda}(z)\,\partial/\partial z := \Theta\big(\lambda(z)\,\partial/\partial z\big) \in \mathfrak{g}'_0 \,.$$

We may therefore assume (possibly after replacing $F$ by $\theta F$ and $a$ by $\theta a$) that $H = H'$, $F = H(a)$ and $F' = H(a')$. Denote by $\Lambda \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ the associative subalgebra generated by all $\lambda \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ with $\lambda(z)\,\partial/\partial z \in \mathfrak{g}_0$. Then $\Lambda$ is abelian, contains the identity of $\mathrm{End}(V)$ and $H \subset \Lambda$. Since $\dim \mathfrak{g} < \infty$, the CR-manifold $F + iV$ is minimal and consequently $F$ cannot be contained in a hyperplane of $V$. This implies $\Lambda(a) = V$ and thus the existence of a $g \in \Lambda$ with $a' = g(a)$. From $gH = Hg$ we get $F' = g(F)$. Since $g(F)$ also cannot be contained in a hyperplane of $V$ finally $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ follows. □

In Propositions 6.5 an d 6.17 a large class of linearly homogeneous conical submanifolds $F \subset V$ is given for which the corresponding tubes $M$ satisfy the condition $\mathfrak{g}_1 = [\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0] = 0$ in Proposition 4.11.

We note that we do not know a single example with $\dim \mathfrak{g} < \infty$ and $\dim \mathfrak{g}_k > \dim \mathfrak{g}_{-k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We also do not know any pair $M, M'$ of holomorphically nondegenerate conical tube manifolds, that are locally CR-equivalent but are not locally affinely equivalent. For Levi nondegenerate tube manifolds (which necessarily cannot be conical) such examples can be found in [13]. In [25] even two affinely homogeneous examples are contained which are locally affinely non-equivalent but whose associated tube manifolds are locally CR-equivalent.

## 5. Some examples

In this section we present two classes of examples. To our knowledge, the only known example of a homogeneous $k$-nondegenerate CR-manifold with $k \geq 3$ occurs in [18] for the case $k = 3$: That is a hypersurface $M$ in a 7-dimensional compact complex manifold, on which the simple Lie group $\mathrm{SO}(3,4)^0$ acts by biholomorphic transformations with orbit $M$. In our first example we give for arbitrary CR-codimenion $c \geq 1$ a minimal homogeneous 3-nondegenerate as well as a minimal homogeneous 4-nondegenerate CR-manifold. The second class of examples deals with tubes $M$ over cones of the form $\{x \in (\mathbb{R}^{+})^n : \sum_{j \leq p} x_j^{\alpha} = \sum_{j > p} x_j^{\alpha}\}$ with $1 \leq p < n$ and $\alpha \neq 0, 1$. Using results from the preceding section, we explicitly determine all Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ for certain $\alpha$. Among these are all hyperquadrics (that is $\alpha = 2$) of signature $(p, q)$ with $q := n - p$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ turns out to be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{so}(p{+}1, q{+}1)$.

The first example of CR-manifolds introduced below consists of tubes $M = \Gamma(a) + iV$ over certain group orbits $\Gamma(a)$, where the connected group $\Gamma := \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) : \det(g) > 0\}$ acts linearly on a real vector space $V$. In that way we obtain homogeneous $k$-nondegenerate CR-manifolds for $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. For dimension reasons it is impossible to construct CR-manifolds of higher nondegeneracy, employing the group $\Gamma = \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})^0$. We do not know how to construct $k$-nondegenerate homogeneous tube manifolds with $k \geq 5$ (should these exist) with suitable other groups, either.

**5.1 Example.** For fixed integers $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $c \geq 1$ let $V \subset \mathbb{R}[u_1, u_2]$ be the subspace of all homogeneous polynomials of degree $m := k + c - 1$. Then the group $\Gamma$ (see above) acts irreducibly on $V$ by $p \mapsto p \circ g^{-1}$ for all $g \in \Gamma$ and has the subgroup $\{g \in \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{id} : g^m = \mathrm{id}\}$ as kernel of ineffectivity. For $a := \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} u_1^j u_2^{m-j} \in V$ the orbit $F = \mathcal{F}^{k,c} := \Gamma(a)$ is a connected conical submanifold of dimension $k$

in $V$. With Proposition 3.7 it is easily seen that

$$K_a^r F = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1-r} \mathbb{R}\, u_1^j u_2^{m-j} \quad \text{for all} \quad r \geq 0\,.$$

In particular, the tube manifold $\mathcal{M}^{k,c} := F + iV$ is a $k$-nondegenerate homogeneous CR-manifold of CR-dimension $k$ and CR-codimension $c$. The manifolds $\mathcal{M}^{2,c}$ will be discussed in more detail in Section 7. In particular, $\mathcal{M}^{2,1}$ is linearly equivalent to the future light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$. For easier handling let us identify $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ with $V$ via $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \;\leftrightsquigarrow\; \sum_{j=0}^{m} x_j u_1^j u_2^{m-j}$ . Since $\Gamma$ acts on $\mathcal{M}^{k,c}$ by (linear) CR-automorphisms, the linear part $\mathfrak{g}_0$ of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}^{k,c}, a)$ (compare 4.2.ii) contains a copy of $\mathfrak{gl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. More explicitly, this subalgebra is spanned by the vector fields

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{m} j z_j \,\partial/\partial z_j\,, &\qquad \xi^{-1,1} &:= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (m-j) z_{j+1} \,\partial/\partial z_j \\ \xi^{1,-1} &:= \sum_{j=1}^{m} j z_{j-1} \,\partial/\partial z_j\,, &\qquad \zeta_2 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{m} (m-j) z_j \,\partial/\partial z_j\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

In particular, the vector fields $\xi^{1,-1}$, $\xi^{-1,1}$ and $\xi^{0,0} := \zeta_1 - \zeta_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m}(2j-m) z_j \,\partial/\partial z_j$ span a copy of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. In case $k = 2$ a straightforward computation shows that $\Gamma_a = \left\{ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & \varepsilon \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \Gamma : \varepsilon^m = 1 \right\}$ is the isotropy subgroup at $a \in \mathcal{M}^{2,c}$. Hence, $\left\{ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ -\beta & \alpha \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \Gamma \right\} \cong \mathbb{C}^*$ acts transitively on $F$, that is, $\mathcal{M}^{2,c}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{C}^*$, where $n := m + 1 = \dim V$.

It seems quite hard to find explicit global equations for $\mathcal{M}^{k,c}$ in case $k > 2$. For $k = 2$ see (7.2). Only for $k = 3$ and $c = 1$ we have the following: Consider in $\mathbb{R}^4$ the algebraic hypersurface given by the homogeneous equation

$$S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_0^2 x_3^2 + 4x_0 x_2^3 - 6x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3 - 3x_1^2 x_2^2 + 4x_1^3 x_3 = 0\}\,. \tag{5.3}$$

It is obvious that $S$ contains the point $a = (1,1,0,0)$. Since the application of every vector field in (5.2) to the defining function of $S$ gives a multiple of this function, $S$ is invariant under the group $\Gamma$. Therefore the 3-nondegenerate homogeneous CR-submanifold $\mathcal{M}^{3,1} = \Gamma(a) + i\mathbb{R}^4$ of $\mathbb{C}^4$ is an open piece of the tube $S + i\mathbb{R}^4$.

**5.4 Example.** Fix integers $p \geq q \geq 1$ with $n := p + q \geq 3$ and a real number $\alpha$ with $\alpha^2 \neq \alpha$. Then

$$F = F_{p,q}^{\alpha} := \Big\{ x \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^n : \sum_{j=1}^{p} x_j^{\alpha} = \sum_{j=p+1}^{n} x_j^{\alpha} \Big\}\,,$$

is a hypersurface in $V := \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, $F$ is a cone and therefore $\dim K_a F \geq 1$ for every $a \in F$. On the other hand, the second derivative at $a$ of the defining equation for $F$ gives a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form on $V \times V$, whose restriction to $T_a F \times T_a F$ then has a kernel of dimension $\leq 1$. Therefore $\dim K_a F = 1$ for every $a \in F$ and by Corollary 3.6 the CR-manifold $M = M_{p,q}^{\alpha} := F_{p,q}^{\alpha} + iV$ is everywhere 2-nondegenerate (compare Example 4.2.5 in [16] for the special case $n = \alpha = 3$). Since $M$ as hypersurface is also minimal, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ has finite dimension.

For the special case $\alpha = 2$ and $q = 1$ the above cone $F = F_{n-1,1}^{2}$ is an open piece of the future light cone

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1^2 + \ldots + x_{n-1}^2 = x_n^2,\; x_n > 0\}$$

in $n$-dimensional space-time, which is affinely homogeneous. In [26] it has been shown that for the corresponding tube manifold $M$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{so}(n, 2)$ for every $a \in M$. In case $q > 1$ the following result seems to be new:

**Case $\alpha = 2$:** Consider on $\mathbb{C}^n$ the symmetric bilinear form $\langle z|w\rangle := \sum \varepsilon_j z_j w_j$. Then $F$ is an open piece of the hypersurface $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \neq 0\,,\ \langle x|x\rangle = 0\}$, on which the reductive group $\mathbb{R}^*\cdot \mathrm{O}(p, q)$ acts transitively. Therefore, $\mathfrak{s}_0 := \mathbb{R}\delta \oplus \mathfrak{so}(p, q)$ is contained in $\mathfrak{g}_0$. One checks that

$$\mathfrak{s} := \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{s}_1\,, \qquad \mathfrak{s}_1 := \Big\{\big(2i\langle c|z\rangle z - i\langle z|z\rangle c\big)\,{\partial}/{\partial z} : c \in \mathbb{R}^n\Big\}$$

is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. The radical $\mathfrak{r}$ of $\mathfrak{s}$ is $\mathrm{ad}(\delta)$-invariant and hence of the form $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{r}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{r}_1$ for $\mathfrak{r}_k := \mathfrak{r} \cap \mathfrak{g}_k$. From $\mathfrak{so}(p, q)$ semisimple we conclude $\mathfrak{r}_0 \subset \mathbb{R}\delta$. But $\delta$ cannot be in $\mathfrak{r}$ since otherwise $\mathfrak{g}_{-1} \subset \mathfrak{r}$ would give the false statement $[\mathfrak{g}_{-1}, \mathfrak{s}_1] \subset \mathbb{R}\delta$. Therefore $\mathfrak{r}_0 = 0$, and $[\mathfrak{g}_{-1}, \mathfrak{r}_1] = [\mathfrak{r}_{-1}, \mathfrak{s}_1] = 0$ implies $\mathfrak{r} = 0$. Now Proposition 3.8 in [26] implies $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}$, and, in particular, that $\mathfrak{g}$ has dimension $\binom{n+2}{2}$. In fact, it can be seen that $\mathfrak{g}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{so}(p + 1, q + 1)$.

**Case $\alpha$ an integer $\geq 3$:** Then $F$ is an open piece of the real-analytic submanifold

$$S := \Big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \neq 0 \quad\text{and}\quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} \varepsilon_j x_j^\alpha = 0\Big\} \tag{5.5}$$

which is connected in case $q > 1$ and has two connected components otherwise. For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let $d(x) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the cardinality of the set $\{j : x_j = 0\}$. It is easily seen that $\dim K_x S = 1 + d(x)$ holds for every $x \in S$. Now consider the group

$$\mathrm{GL}(F) := \{g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) : g(F) = F\}\,.$$

Every $g \in \mathrm{GL}(F)$ leaves $S$ and hence also $H := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(x) > 0\}$ invariant, that is, $g$ is the product of a diagonal with a permutation matrix. Inspecting the action of $\mathrm{GL}(F)$ on $\{c \in \overline{F} : d(c) = n - 2\}$ we see that $\mathrm{GL}(F)$ as group is generated by $\mathbb{R}^+\cdot\,\mathrm{id}$ and certain coordinate permutations. As a consequence, $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathbb{R}\delta$. Now suppose that there exists a non-zero vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_1$. Then $\xi = q(z, z)\,{\partial}/{\partial z}$ for some symmetric bilinear map $q : \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ with $q(c, z)\,{\partial}/{\partial z} \in \mathbb{C}\delta$ for every $c \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Because of $q \neq 0$ symmetric therefore any two vectors in $\mathbb{C}^n$ must be linearly dependent, which contradicts $n \geq 3$. Therefore $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$ and hence $\mathfrak{g}_k = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$ by Proposition 4.4.iv. In particular, $\dim \mathfrak{g} = n + 1 < \dim M$ for the tube manifold $M = F + iV$, that is, $M$ is not locally homogeneous. For $n = 3$ this gives an alternative proof for Proposition 6.36 in [17].

**5.6 Proposition.** *Let $a, a' \in F = F^\alpha_{p,q}$ be arbitrary points. Then in case $3 \leq \alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ the CR-manifold germs $(M, a)$ and $(M, a')$ are CR-equivalent if and only if $a' \in \mathrm{GL}(F)(a)$.*

*Proof.* Suppose that $g : (M, a) \to (M, a')$ is an isomorphism of CR-manifold germs. From $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}'_{-1} \oplus \mathbb{R}\delta$ for $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{hol}(M', a')$ Proposition 4.4.iii implies that $g$ is represented by a linear transformation in $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ that we also denote by $g$. But then $g(F) \subset S$ with $S$ defined in (5.5). Because $g(F)$ has empty intersection with $H$ we actually have $g(F) \subset F$. Replacing $g$ by its inverse we get the opposite inclusion, that is $g \in \mathrm{GL}(F)$. □

## 6. Levi degenerate CR-manifolds associated with an endomorphism

The lowest CR-dimension for which there exist homogeneous CR-manifolds that are Levi degenerate but not holomorphically degenerate is 2. The construction recipe below will give, up to local affine equivalence, all affinely homogeneous conical tube submanifolds of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with CR-dimension 2. Indeed, it is based on the following simple observation: Suppose that $F \subset V := \mathbb{R}^n$ is a conical locally linearly homogeneous submanifold of dimension 2. Denote by $\mathfrak{a}$ the Lie algebra of all linear vector fields on $V$ that are tangent to $F$. Then, fixing a point $a \in F$, there exists a $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ with $\varphi(x)\,{\partial}/{\partial x} \in \mathfrak{a}$ and

$T_aF = \mathbb{R}a \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi(a)$. Therefore, the orbit $H(a)$ under the subgroup $H := \{\exp(r\,\mathrm{id} + t\,\varphi) : r, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is an (immersed) surface in $V$ having the same germ at $a$ as $F$.

**6.1 Construction recipe.** Throughout this section let $1 < d < n$ be arbitrary integers and $V$ a real vector space of dimension $n$. Let furthermore $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ be a fixed endomorphism and $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ the linear span of all powers $\varphi^k$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$. Then $H := \exp(\mathfrak{h}) \subset \mathrm{GL}(V)$ is an abelian subgroup, and for given $a \in V$ the orbit $F := H(a)$ is a cone and an immersed submanifold of $V$ (not necessarily locally closed in case $n \geq 4$). Furthermore, the tube $M = F + iV \subset E$ is an immersed CR-submanifold of $E$.

**6.2 Cyclic endomorphisms and vectors.** A vector $a \in V$ is called *cyclic* with respect to $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ if the $\varphi^k(a)$, $k \geq 0$, span $V$. This is equivalent to $a, \varphi(a), \ldots, \varphi^{n-1}(a)$ being a basis of $V$. We call $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ *cyclic* if it has a cyclic vector and denote by $\mathrm{Cyc}(V) \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ the subset of all cyclic endomorphisms. If $a, b \in V$ both are cyclic vectors of $\varphi$ then there exists a transformation $g \in \mathbb{R}[\varphi] \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ with $b = g(a)$. But $g$ commutes with every element of the group $H = \exp(\mathfrak{h})$ and hence maps the orbit $H(a)$ onto $H(b)$. In particular, the CR-isomorphism type of $M = H(a) + iV$ only depends on $\varphi$ and $d$, but not on the choice of the cyclic vector $a$. To emphasize this dependence we also write $M^{\varphi,d}$ for $M$ and $F^{\varphi,d}$ for $H(a)$, but only if $\varphi$ is cyclic. We tacitly assume that a choice for a cyclic vector $a$ has been made. In case $d = 2$ we even write $M^{\varphi}$ and $F^{\varphi}$ instead of $M^{\varphi,2}$ and $F^{\varphi,2}$, respectively. The following proposition shows the relevance of these manifolds in our discussion.

**6.3 Proposition.** *For $F = H(a)$ and $M = F + iV$ as in* 6.1 *the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ *has finite dimension.*

(ii) $a$ *is a cyclic vector of* $\varphi$.

*If these conditions are satisfied, $M$ is a minimal 2-nondegenerate homogeneous CR-manifold with CR-dimension $d$ and Levi kernel $K_aM = \mathbb{C}a$.*

*Proof.* (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Condition (i) together with the homogeneity of $M$ implies that $M$ is minimal. Let $W \subset V$ be the linear span of all vectors $\varphi^k(a)$, $k \geq 0$. Then $H \subset \mathbb{R}[\varphi]$ implies $H(a) \subset W$ and hence $W = V$ by the minimality of $M$. Therefore, $a$ is a cyclic vector, and the $\varphi^k(a)$, $0 \leq k < d$, form a basis of the tangent space $T_aF$. In particular, $F$ has dimension $d$, which is also the CR-dimension of $M$.
(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Suppose that $a$ is a cyclic vector of $\varphi$. Lemma 3.2 gives $\mathbb{R}a \subset K_aF$ since $F$ is a cone in $V$. For the proof of the opposite inclusion fix an arbitrary $w \in T_aF$ with $w \notin \mathbb{R}a$. Then $w = \sum_0^m c_j\varphi^j(a)$ with $c_m \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq m < d$ and $\varphi^{d-m}(w) \notin T_aF$ shows $w \notin K_aF$ by Proposition 3.7. Therefore, $M$ is 2-nondegenerate by Corollary 3.6 and $K_aM = \mathbb{C}a$. It remains to show that $M$ is minimal at $a$. But this immediately follows from Proposition 3.8. ☐

For the manifolds $M = M^{\varphi,d}$ it is possible to compute the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ in ‘most cases’. Clearly, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ contains the $d$-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ (as before, $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is canonically identified with a linear subspace of $\mathrm{End}(V)$). In the Propositions 6.5 and 6.17 we will show that the equality $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{h}$ holds for all $\varphi$ in ‘general position’.

Suppose that $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ has the cyclic vector $a \in V$ and that the integer $d$ satisfies $1 < d < n$. Let

$$\chi_\varphi := \prod_{j=1}^{s}(X - \lambda_j)^{n_j} \;\in\; \mathbb{R}[X]\,, \quad n_j \geq 1\,, \tag{6.4}$$

with mutually distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s \in \mathbb{C}$ be the characteristic polynomial of $\varphi$. Let furthermore $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ be the family of all roots of $\chi_\varphi$, that is, each $\lambda_j$ occurs $n_j$-times in this string. As usual, $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ is called an *arithmetic progression* in $\mathbb{C}$ if there exists a $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ such that, after a suitable permutation, $\alpha_j = \alpha_1 + (j-1)\beta$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

**6.5 Proposition.** *Let $M = M^{\varphi,d}$ and $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ for a cyclic vector $a \in V \cap M$ of $\varphi$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$ holds if one of the following conditions is satisfied.*

(i) $d = 2$ *and the characteristic roots $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ of $\varphi$ do not form an arithmetic progression.*

(ii) $d \geq 3$ *and* $s > d$.

For the proof we need several preparations. To simplify the notation at various places let us introduce

$$S := \{1, \dots, s\}, \quad m := d - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad m_k := n_k - 1 \ \text{ for all } \ k \in S\,. \tag{6.6}$$

For every $K \subset S$ define furthermore

$$\Delta_K := \big\{\beta_{jk} : j \in S, k \in K\big\} \ \text{ with } \ \beta_{jk} := (\lambda_j - \lambda_k, \lambda_j^2 - \lambda_k^2, \dots, \lambda_j^m - \lambda_k^m) \in \mathbb{C}^m \tag{6.7}$$

and denote by $\mathscr{K}$ the set of all non-empty subsets $K \subset S$ such that there exist subsets $P \subset Q \subset (S \setminus K)$ with the following two properties, where the maximum over the empty set here is defined to be 0 :

(i) $\sum_{k\in K} n_k \ + \ \sum_{q\in Q} n_q \ \ \geq \ \ d \ + \ \max\{n_p - 1 : p \in P\}\,.$

(ii) To every $\beta \in \Delta_Q \setminus \Delta_K$ there exist uniquely determined $j \in S$ and $q \in Q$ with $\beta = \beta_{jq}$ such that $n_j < n_q$ and $q \in P$.

Notice that $\mathscr{K}$ contains every subset $K \subset S$ with $\sum_{k\in K} n_k \geq d$ (just take $Q = \varnothing$). In the following Lemma we show that (i) or (ii) in Proposition 6.5 will follow from a more general technical condition that will allow us to give a uniform proof of 6.5 for all $d$.

**6.8 Lemma.** *Suppose that $s \geq d$ and $\bigcap_{K\in\mathscr{K}} \Delta_K = \{0\}$ holds. Then one of the conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition* 6.5 *is satisfied.*

*Proof.* $\boldsymbol{d = 2}$**:** Assume that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ is not an arithmetic progression and that there exists a non-zero $\beta \in \bigcap_{K\in\mathscr{K}} \Delta_K$. We claim that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ is an arithmetic progression: Otherwise $s \geq 3$ and there exists a $k$ with $1 < k < s$ such that, without loss of generality, $\lambda_j = \lambda_1 + (j-1)\beta$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $\lambda_1 - \beta \neq \lambda_r \neq \lambda_k + \beta$ for all $r > k$. For every $j > k$ the set $\Delta_{\{k,j\}}$ contains the number $\beta$, that is, there is an $r \in S$ with $\lambda_r = \lambda_k + \beta$ or $\lambda_r = \lambda_j + \beta$. The first possibility violates our assumptions. In the second case necessarily $r > k$ must hold since $r \leq k$ would imply $\lambda_j = \lambda_1 - \beta$ and thus the second possibility cannot be true for *all* $j$ with $k < j \leq s$. This proves that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ is an arithmetic progression and also $s < n$ by assumption. In particular, $n_j > 1$ for some $j \in S$. Next we claim that $\{1\} \in \mathscr{K}$ and $\{s\} \in \mathscr{K}$: To see that $\{1\} \in \mathscr{K}$, let $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ be minimal with $n_k > 1$. With $P := Q := \{k\} \setminus \{1\}$ condition (6.7).ii is fulfilled and the first part of the claim follows. A similar argument proves also $\{s\} \in \mathscr{K}$. But then $\Delta_{\{1\}} \cap \Delta_{\{s\}} = \{0\}$ gives a contradiction.

$\boldsymbol{d \geq 3}$**:** Suppose that $0 \neq \beta_{jk} \in \bigcap_{K\in\mathscr{K}} \Delta_K$ and that $s > d$. Then $L := S \setminus \{k\} \in \mathscr{K}$ (with $Q = \varnothing$) and there are $\ell \in L$, $r \in S$ with $\beta_{jk} = \beta_{r\ell}$. Since $d \geq 3$, the equation $\beta_{jk} = \beta_{r\ell}$ implies $k = \ell$, a contradiction. ☐

**Proof of Proposition 6.5:** It is enough to assume that the assumption of Lemma 6.8 is satisfied. Consider the decomposition $E = E_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_s$ with $E_k$ the kernel of $(\varphi - \lambda_k)^n$ for every $k \in S$. Denote by $\pi_k : E \to E_k$ the canonical projection and by $\varepsilon_k : E_k \to E$ the canonical injection. Then $a_k := \pi_k(a)$ is a cyclic vector for $\varphi_k := \pi_k\varphi\varepsilon_k \in \operatorname{End}(E_k)$. Furthermore, if we put $a_k^j := (\varphi_k - \lambda_k)^j(a_k)$ for all $j \geq 0$, then $a_k^0, \dots, a_k^{m_k}$ is a basis of $E_k$. With $m = d - 1$ as defined above let $\Phi := (\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^m) \in \operatorname{End}(V)^m$.

For every real (or complex) vector space $W$ and all tuples $t = (t_1, \dots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $w = (w_1, \dots, w_m) \in W^m$ let us write as shorthand $t{\cdot}w := \sum_j t_j w_j$. For every $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the point $e^{t\cdot\Phi}(a)$ is contained in $F = M \cap V$.

Now fix an arbitrary $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_0 \subset \operatorname{End}(V)$. Since the vector field $\mu$ is tangent to $F$, to every $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ there exist real coefficients $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_m$ with

$$\mu e^{t\cdot\Phi}(a) \ = \ Re^{t\cdot\Phi}(a) \quad \text{for} \quad R := \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} r_\ell \varphi^\ell\,. \tag{6.9}$$

Actually, every $r_\ell$ has to be considered as a real valued function on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Put

$$\mu_k := \pi_k\mu \quad \text{and} \quad N_k := \big((\varphi_k - \lambda_k), \dots, (\varphi_k^m - \lambda_k^m)\big) \ \in \ \operatorname{End}(E)^m$$

for all $k \in S$. Applying $\pi_k$ to (6.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned} R\,e^{t\cdot N_k}(a_k) &= e^{t\cdot N_k}R(a_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{s} e^{t\cdot\beta_{jk}}\mu_k e^{t\cdot N_j}(a_j) \quad \text{with} \\ R(a_k) &= \sum_{j=0}^{m_k} \varrho_{k,j}a_k^j \quad \text{for} \quad \varrho_{k,j}(t) := \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} \tbinom{\ell}{j}\lambda_k^{\ell-j}r_\ell(t) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

For every subset $B \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ denote by $\mathscr{F}(B) \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{C})$ the smallest linear subspace containing all functions $h(t)e^{t\cdot\beta}$ with $\beta \in B$ and $h \in \mathbb{C}[t] = \mathbb{C}[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$ a polynomial function on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then it is well known that every $f \in \mathscr{F}(B)$ has a unique representation $f = \sum_{\beta\in B} f^{[\beta]}e^{t\cdot\beta}$ with $f^{[\beta]} \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ and $\{\beta \in B : f^{[\beta]} \neq 0\}$ finite. Since $t\cdot N_j$ is nilpotent, i.e., $e^{\pm t\cdot N_j}$ are polynomial, as a consequence of the identities (6.10) we get for every $K \subset S$

$$\varrho_{k,j} \in \mathscr{F}(\Delta_K) \quad \text{for every} \quad k \in K \ \text{ and } \ 0 \le j \le m_k \, . \tag{6.11}$$

Denote by $\mathscr{B}$ the set of all subsets $B \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ with $r_\ell \in \mathscr{F}(B)$ for all $\ell$.

**Claim 1:** $\bigcap_{K\in\mathscr{K}} \Delta_K \in \mathscr{B}$*, that is,* $r_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ *for all* $\ell$.
*Proof of the claim.* Fix an arbitrary $K \in \mathscr{K}$ and let $P \subset Q$ be as in the definition of $\mathscr{K}$. Since $\mathscr{B}$ is closed under intersections it is enough to show $\Delta_K \in \mathscr{B}$. Assume to the contrary that this is not true. Consider the linear system of equations for the $r_\ell$, compare also 6.16,

$$\varrho_{k,j} = \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} \tbinom{\ell}{j}\lambda_k^{\ell-j}r_\ell \in \mathscr{F}(\Delta_{K\cup Q}) \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in K \cup Q \ \text{ and } \ 0 \le j \le m_k \, . \tag{6.12}$$

The coefficient matrix is of generalized Vandermonde type and hence has rank $d = m + 1$ since by the definition of $\mathscr{K}$ the number of equations is at least $d$. This implies $r_\ell \in \mathscr{F}(\Delta_K \cup \Delta_Q)$ for all $\ell$. Since by assumption not all $r_\ell$ are in $\mathscr{F}(\Delta_K)$ there is a $\beta \in \Delta_Q \smallsetminus \Delta_K$ such that the $\beta$-components $r_\ell^{[\beta]} \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ do not vanish for all $\ell$ simultaneously. By the definition of $\mathscr{K}$ there are uniquely determined $p \in S$ and $q \in P$ with $\beta = \beta_{pq}$. Define $L := K \cup Q \smallsetminus \{q\}$. Since $\beta \notin \Delta_L$ we get from (6.10) the following linear system

$$\varrho_{k,j}^{[\beta]} = \sum_{\ell=j}^{m} \tbinom{\ell}{j}\lambda_k^{\ell-j}r_\ell^{[\beta]} = 0\,, \quad \text{where } \ k \ \text{ runs through } \ L \ \text{ and } \ 0 \le j \le m_k \ . \tag{6.13}$$

By the very definition of $K$, $P$ and $Q$ it follows that the above linear system consists of at least $d - 1$ equations. Consequently we can write it in the form:

$$\sum_{\ell=j}^{m-1} \tbinom{\ell}{j}\lambda_k^{\ell-j}r_\ell^{[\beta]} \in \mathbb{C}r_m^{[\beta]} \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in L \ \text{ and } \ 0 \le j \le m_k \ .$$

Since its coefficient matrix is of generalized Vandermonde type, every $r_\ell^{[\beta]}$ is a complex multiple of $r_m^{[\beta]}$ and, in particular, $r_m^{[\beta]} \neq 0$. We claim $\varrho_{q,0}^{[\beta]} \neq 0$. Indeed, otherwise we could add the equation $\varrho_{q,0}^{[\beta]} = 0$ to the linear system (6.13), which then has a coefficient matrix of generalized Vandermonde type with rank $d$ contradicting $r_m^{[\beta]} \neq 0$. Denote by $D$ the degree of $\varrho_{q,0}^{[\beta]} = \sum_\ell \lambda_q^\ell r_\ell^{[\beta]}$. Then $D = \deg \varrho_{q,0}^{[\beta]} = \deg r_m^{[\beta]} \ge 0$ and all $r_\ell$ and $\varrho_{q,j}^{[\beta]}$ have degree $\le D$. The equations (6.10) imply (replace $k$ by $q$, form the $\beta$-components for $\beta := \beta_{pq}$ and carry out the multiplication with $e^{t\cdot N_q}$)

$$\mu_q e^{t\cdot N_p}(a_p) = e^{t\cdot N_q}\sum_{j=0}^{m_q} \varrho_{q,j}^{[\beta]}a_q^j = \sum_{j=0}^{m_q} \big(f_j\varrho_{q,0}^{[\beta]} + g_j\big)a_q^j \tag{6.14}$$

for certain polynomials $f_j, g_j \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ with $\deg(g_j) < \deg(f_j) = j$. Comparing degrees on both sides in (6.14) and keeping in mind $n_p < n_q$ (by the definition of $\mathscr{K}$) we get

$$D + m_q = \deg(f_{m_q}\varrho^{[\beta]}_{q,m_q} + g_{m_q}) \le m_p < m_q \,.$$

This contradicts $r^{[\beta]}_m \neq 0$ and Claim 1 is proved. □

**Claim 2:** *Every $r_\ell$ is a constant polynomial.*
*Proof of the claim.* Fix a $k \in S$ with $D := \deg(\varrho_{k,0}) = \max_{j\in S}\deg(\varrho_{j,0})$. With $s \ge d$ a Vandermonde argument applied to the linear system $\varrho_{j,0} = \sum_\ell \lambda_j^\ell r_\ell,\ j \in S$, gives that every $r_\ell$ has degree $\le D$. As in (6.14) we have

$$\mu_k e^{t\cdot N_k}(a_k) \;=\; e^{t\cdot N_k}\sum_{j=0}^{m_k}\varrho_{k,j}a_k^j = \sum_{j=0}^{m_k}\big(f_j\varrho_{k,0} + g_j\big)a_k^j \tag{6.15}$$

for polynomials $f_j, g_j \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ with $\deg(g_j) < \deg(f_j) = j$. All coefficient polynomials in (6.15) in front of the $a_k^j$ have degree $\le m_k$, that is $D + m_k \le m_k$ and hence $D \le 0$. This proves Claim 2. □

The proof of 6.5 now is complete: Indeed, since $F$ contains a basis of $V$, the endomorphism $\mu$ is uniquely determined by the function tuple $(r_\ell)$, that is, $\dim\mathfrak{g}_0 \le d = \dim\mathfrak{h}$. □

**6.16 Remark.** For given tuples $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s \in \mathbb{C}$ and $n_1, \ldots, n_s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_k \ge 1$ and $n := \sum n_k$ let $L := \{(k,j) : 1 \le k \le s,\ 0 \le j < n_k\}$ endowed with the lexicographic order. Then it can be seen that the following $n\times n$-matrix (every entry with $\ell < j$ is zero)

$$\Big(\tbinom{\ell}{j}\lambda_k^{\ell-j}\Big)_{0\le\ell<n,(k,j)\in L} \qquad \text{has determinant} \quad \prod_{p<q}(\lambda_q - \lambda_p)^{n_pn_q} \;.$$

Notice from the proof of 6.5 that the condition $\bigcap_{K\in\mathscr{K}}\Delta_K = \{0\}$ guarantees that every $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ leaves every generalized eigenspace $E_k$ of $\varphi$ invariant, while $s \ge d$ guarantees that every such $\mu$ actually is in $\mathfrak{h}$. In the next section we will see that the condition (i) in Proposition 6.5 for $d = 2$ is optimal, compare Proposition 7.3.

**6.17 Proposition.** *Let $M = M^{\varphi,d}$ and assume that $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$ for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M,a)$. Then $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{aff}(M,a)$ and $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) = 0$.*

*Proof.* For the proof of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{aff}(M,a)$ it is enough to show $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$ by Proposition 4.2.iv. This is more easily done in the more general complex setting, compare the following Lemma 6.18. Finally, counting dimensions yields $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) = 0$. □

It remains to show the next Lemma. As before,we identify the spaces $\mathrm{End}(E)$ and $\mathfrak{P}_0$, see (4.1).

**6.18 Lemma.** *Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(E)$ be an arbitrary cyclic endomorphisms. For given integer $d < n = \dim E$ let furthermore $\mathfrak{h}$ be the complex linear span of all powers $\varphi^j$, $0 \le j < d$. Then*

$$\big\{\xi \in \mathfrak{P}_1 : [\mathfrak{P}_{-1}, \xi] \subset \mathfrak{h}\big\} \;= 0 \;.$$

*Proof.* We identify $E$ with $\mathbb{C}^n$ in such a way that the matrix $\Phi$ of $\varphi$ is in Jordan normal form, more precisely: $\Phi$ is a block diagonal matrix with Jordan blocks $J_1, \ldots, J_s$, where each block $J_l$ is lower triangular, has the eigenvalue $\lambda_l$ on its main diagonal and is of size $n_l \times n_l$ for some $n_l \ge 1$. We also introduce an equivalence relation on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ in the following way: Put $j \sim k$ if the $j$th row and the $k$th column in $\Phi$ intersect in one of the Jordan blocks.
Now suppose that there exists a non-zero vector field $\xi \in \mathfrak{P}_1$ with $[\mathfrak{P}_{-1}, \xi] \subset \mathfrak{h}$. This $\xi$ has a unique

representation

$$\xi = \sum_{j,k,p=1}^{n} c_p^{jk} z_j z_k \, {\partial}/{\partial z_p} \quad \text{with} \quad c_p^{jk} = c_p^{kj} \in \mathbb{C}\,.$$

For every $j \leq n$ the vector field ${\partial}/{\partial z_j}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{P}_{-1}$. Therefore

$$\xi_j := \frac{1}{2}\big[{\partial}/{\partial z_j}, \xi\big] = \sum_{k,p=1}^{n} c_p^{jk} z_k \, {\partial}/{\partial z_p}$$

is contained in $\mathfrak{h}$ implying $c_p^{jk} = 0$ if $k \not\sim p$ and, by symmetry, $c_p^{jk} = 0$ if $j \not\sim p$. This implies

$$\xi_j = \sum_{p\sim j} \sum_{k\sim j} c_p^{jk} z_k \, {\partial}/{\partial z_p}\,. \tag{6.19}$$

By assumption $\xi \neq 0$ and therefore $\xi_r \neq 0$ for some $r \leq n$. Without loss of generality we may assume $r \sim 1$. Replacing $\varphi$ by $(\varphi - \lambda_1)$ we also may assume $\lambda_1 = 0$. Put $b := n_1$, that is, the Jordan block $J_1$ has size $b \times b$ and is nilpotent. Define for all $1 \leq p, k \leq b$

$$\eta_p := z_1 \, {\partial}/{\partial z_p} + z_2 \, {\partial}/{\partial z_{p+1}} + \ldots + z_{b+1-p} \, {\partial}/{\partial z_b}\,,$$

$$\mathfrak{D}_k := \sum_{j=k}^{b} \mathbb{C}\eta_j \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_k := \varphi^{k-1} \prod_{l=2}^{s} (\varphi - \lambda_l)^{n_l} \;\in\; \mathrm{End}(E)\,.$$

From (6.19) we know $\xi_j \in \mathfrak{D}_1 \cap \mathfrak{h}$ for all $j \leq b$. In particular,

$$\xi_j = \sum_{p=1}^{b} c_p^{j1} \eta_p\,, \qquad c_p^{jk} = \begin{cases} c_{p+1-k}^{j1} & \text{if } k \leq p \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \qquad \text{and hence}$$

$$\xi_j = c_1^{11} \eta_j + c_2^{11} \eta_{j+1} + \ldots + c_{b+1-j}^{11} \eta_b$$

for all $j$ due to the symmetry of $c_p^{jk}$ in the upper indices. As a consequence there exists a minimal $q \leq b$ with $q \geq 1$ and $c_q^{11} \neq 0$. But then $\xi_{b+1-q} = c_q^{11} \eta_b$ implies $\eta_b \in \mathfrak{D}_b \cap \mathfrak{h}$. We show that this cannot be true: Since $\psi_1$ as polynomial in $\varphi$ has constant term $\lambda_2 \lambda_3 \ldots \lambda_s \neq 0$, we get that $\psi_k$ spans $\mathfrak{D}_k$ over $\mathfrak{D}_{k+1}$ for every $k \geq 1$. This implies $\eta_b = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_j \varphi^{j-1}$ for suitable real coefficients $e_j$ with $e_n \neq 0$ and thus $\eta_b \notin \mathfrak{h}$. $\square$

For the application of Proposition 3.10 to manifolds of the type $M = M^{\varphi,d}$ it is necessary to know when $M$ is simply connected and when $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ is the trivial group.
A sufficient condition for $M^{\varphi,d}$ (and $F^{\varphi,d} = H(a)$) to be simply connected is the following: *There exist eigenvalues* $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d$ *of* $\varphi$ *such that* $\det(A + \overline{A}) \neq 0$*, where* $A = (\lambda_j^{k-1})_{1\leq j,k\leq d}$ *is the corresponding Vandermonde matrix.*
To get a partial answer to the second question consider to given $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^*$ a $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ with $g(a) = a$ and $g\varphi g^{-1} = \varepsilon\varphi$. From $g\varphi^k g^{-1} = (\varepsilon\varphi)^k$ we get $g(\varphi^k(a)) = \varepsilon^k \varphi^k(a)$ for all $k \geq 0$, that is, $g$ is uniquely determined in $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ by the above assumptions since $\varphi$ is cyclic. A further consequence is $g\exp(t\varphi^k)g^{-1} = \exp(t\varepsilon^k\varphi^k)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \geq 0$. This means $gHg^{-1} = H$ for the group $H = \exp(\mathfrak{h})$. But then $g(F) = F$ for $F = H(a)$ and consequently $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$.

Notice that we always may assume without loss of generality that $\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(V)$ has trace 0 (otherwise replace $\varphi$ by $(\varphi - c\,\mathrm{id}) \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ for $c := n^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}(\varphi)$, since this procedure does not change the algebra $\mathfrak{h}$).

**6.20 Lemma.** *Suppose that $2d \le n+1$ for $n = \dim V$ and that $\varphi$ is trace-free. Suppose in addition that $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) = 0$ holds for the cyclic vector $a \in V$ and $M := M^{\varphi,d}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(M,a) = \big\{g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) : g(a) = a \ \text{ and } \ g\varphi g^{-1} = \pm\varphi\big\}\,.$$

*In particular, $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ always has order $\le 2$ and is trivial, for instance, if the spectrum of $\varphi$ in $\mathbb{C}$ is not symmetric with respect to the origin of $\mathbb{C}$.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.8 the assumption $\mathfrak{aut}(M,a) = 0$ implies $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$. As a consequence of Proposition 4.10 therefore $\mathrm{Aut}(M,a) = \big\{g \in \mathrm{GL}(V) : g(a) = a \text{ and } g\mathfrak{h}g^{-1} = \mathfrak{h}\big\}$ holds. Let $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(M,a)$ be an arbitrary automorphism. Then $g\varphi g^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{m} c_j\varphi^j$ for real coefficients $c_j$ and $m := d-1$. We show by induction on $k$ that $c_j = 0$ holds for all $j > m/k$ and all $1 \le k \le m$. For $k = 1$ this is obvious. So fix a $k > 1$ with $k \le m$. By induction hypothesis $g\varphi^k g^{-1} = \big(\sum c_j\varphi^j\big)^k = \sum_{\ell=0}^{2m} e_\ell\varphi^\ell \in \mathfrak{h}$ with real coefficients $e_\ell$. Since $2m < n$ by assumption, we must have $e_\ell = 0$ for all $\ell > m$, that is $c_j = 0$ for all $j > m/k$. For $k = m$ this implies $c_j = 0$ for all $j > 1$. Taking traces finally gives $g\varphi g^{-1} = \varepsilon\varphi$ for $\varepsilon := c_1$. By the above example $\varphi$ cannot be nilpotent, that is, $\varphi$ has non-zero spectrum in $\mathbb{C}$. Since this spectrum is invariant under multiplication with $\varepsilon$ necessarily $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ holds. □

## 7. Homogeneous 2-nondegenerate manifolds of CR-dimension 2

In this section we specialize to homogeneous tube manifolds $M = F + iV$ in $E = V \oplus iV$ of CR-dimension 2, that is, where $F \subset V$ is a surface of dimension 2. We begin with manifolds of type $M^\varphi = M^{\varphi,2}$ that are obtained by the construction recipe 6.1. Since Propositions 6.5 and 6.17 of the preceding section do not cover the case where the characteristic roots $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ of $\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(V)$, $n = \dim V$, form an arithmetic progression, let us discuss this case first:
Possibly after replacing $\varphi$ by $\varphi - r\,\mathrm{id}$ with an appropriately chosen constant $r$ we may assume without loss of generality that $\varphi$ is trace-free. Since multiplication of $\varphi$ by any non-zero real number does not change the algebra $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{id} \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi$, there are essentially 3 different cases for $\varphi$ with characteristic roots forming an arithmetic progression – either $\varphi$ is nilpotent or $\varphi$ has pairwise different characteristic roots in $\mathbb{R}$ or in $i\mathbb{R}$. Consider the manifold $M := \mathcal{M}^{2,n-2} = \mathcal{F}^{2,n-2} + iV$ from Example 5.1. As already remarked in 5.1 the conformal subgroup $H^{\mathrm{i}} := \mathbb{R}^+\!\cdot \mathrm{SO}(2) \subset \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{F}^{2,n-2}$. The corresponding Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathrm{i}} := \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{id} \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi_{\mathrm{i}}$, where $\varphi_{\mathrm{i}} := \xi^{1,-1} - \xi^{-1,1} \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a trace-free semisimple endomorphism with eigenvalues in $i\mathbb{R}$, see (5.2) for the notation. Next consider the subgroup $H^{\mathrm{r}} := \mathbb{R}^+\!\cdot \mathrm{SO}(1,1) \subset \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}} := \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{id} \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi_{\mathrm{r}}$, where $\varphi_{\mathrm{r}} := \xi^{1,-1} + \xi^{-1,1} \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a trace-free semisimple endomorphism with real eigenvalues. In particular, $H^{\mathrm{r}}(a)$ is open in $H^{\mathrm{i}}(a)$. Finally, consider the solvable subgroup

$$H^{\mathrm{z}} := \Big\{\begin{pmatrix}\alpha & 0\\ \beta & \alpha\end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{R}) : \alpha > 0\Big\} \ \text{ with Lie algebra } \ \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{z}} := \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{id} \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi_{\mathrm{z}}\,,$$

where $\varphi_{\mathrm{z}} := \xi^{1,-1}$ only has zero eigenvalues. Again, the orbit $H^{\mathrm{z}}(a)$ is open in $H^{\mathrm{i}}(a)$. This implies that the manifolds $M^{\varphi_{\mathrm{r}}}$ and $M^{\varphi_{\mathrm{z}}}$ are open subsets of $M^{\varphi_{\mathrm{i}}} = \mathcal{M}^{2,n-2}$ and hence that all three of them are locally CR-equivalent. Since $\mathcal{M}^{2,n-2}$ is minimal as CR-manifold the endomorphisms $\varphi_{\mathrm{i}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{r}}$ and $\varphi_{\mathrm{z}}$ have $a$ as cyclic vector by Proposition 6.3 (what also easily can be verified). By construction, the characteristic roots of the endomorphisms $\varphi_{\mathrm{i}}$, $\varphi_{\mathrm{r}}$ and $\varphi_{\mathrm{z}}$ form an arithmetic progression and represent the three types with imaginary, real and zero characteristic roots. The estimate $\dim\mathfrak{g}_0 \ge 4 > \dim\mathfrak{h}^\psi$ for $\psi = \varphi_{\mathrm{i}}, \varphi_r, \varphi_n$ together with Propositions 6.5 and 6.17 implies that the characteristic roots of all 3 endomorphisms form an arithmetic progression. Summing up we have proved the following result.

**7.1 Proposition.** *Let $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ be endomorphisms with cyclic vectors $a, a' \in V$. Assume that for both endomorphisms the families of characteristic roots $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ and $\alpha'_1, \ldots, \alpha'_n$ form an arithmetic progression. Then the germs $(M^\varphi, a)$ and $(M^{\varphi'}, a')$ are CR-equivalent.*

We can use Proposition 7.1 to get explicit global equations for every $M^\varphi$ where the characteristic roots of $\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(V)$ form an arithmetic progression: Indeed, we may take $\varphi := \xi^{1,-1}$ from (5.2) on $\mathbb{C}^{m+1}$

with coordinates $(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_m)$ and $a := (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then $\varphi$ is nilpotent and $S := \exp(\mathbb{R}\varphi)(a) = \{(1, t, t^2, \dots, t^m) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Consequently, $M^\varphi = F + iV$ is the tube over the cone $F$ generated by $S$ (that is $F = \mathbb{R}^+{\cdot}S$). As a consequence, $F$ is an open piece of the algebraic surface given by the following explicit system of quadratic equations on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ with coordinates $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m)$

$$x_0 x_{j+1} = x_1 x_j \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < j < m\,. \tag{7.2}$$

This can be reformulated also in the following slightly different form: Let $C := \{(t, t^2, \dots, t^n) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ be the *twisted $n$-ic* (also called twisted cubic, quartic etc, see [23] for interesting properties of these curves). Then the cone $\mathbb{R}^+{\cdot}C$ generated by $C$ is a nonsingular surface outside the origin and the corresponding tube manifold is locally CR-equivalent to $M^\varphi$ with $\varphi$ as in 7.1. The twisted $n$-ic will also show up in another type of examples, compare 7.10.

Next we extend Propositions 6.5 and 6.17 to the case $d = 2$ where the characteristic roots of $\varphi$ do form an arithmetic progression. Recall that for the light cone tube $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{M}^{2,1}$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, a)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{so}(2,3)$, compare [26], [19]. In particular, $\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $\dim \mathfrak{g}_1 = 3$ in this case.

**7.3 Proposition.** *Assume that the characteristic roots of $\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(V)$ form an arithmetic progression. Then for $M = M^\varphi$, $n = \dim V$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ the following properties hold.*

(i) $\mathfrak{g}_0$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ *and hence has dimension* 4.

(ii) $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$ *in case* $n \geq 4$. *In particular,* $\dim \mathfrak{g} = n + 4$ *in this case.*

*Proof.* ad (i): We may assume that $\lambda_j = (1 - n)/2 + (j - 1)$ for all $j \in S$ using the notation in (6.6) and (6.7). Then $\bigcap_{K \in \mathscr{K}} \Delta_K = \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Solving (6.9) for $r_0, r_1$ gives that all pairs

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 &= (n-1)(ue^{-t} + v_0 - we^{t}) \\ r_1 &= 2(ue^{-t} + v_1 + we^{t})\,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

$u, v_0, v_1, w \in \mathbb{R}$ arbitrary, form the solution space. This implies $\dim \mathfrak{g}_0 = 4$. Since $M$ is locally CR-equivalent to $\mathcal{M}^{2,n-2}$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ contains a copy of $\mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{R})$, that is $\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{R})$.
ad (ii): Let $n \geq 4$. We may assume that for $m = n - 1$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ is the linear span of the vector fields (5.2). For every $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ let $\mathfrak{g}^\nu := \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g} : [\zeta_j, \xi] = \nu_j \xi \text{ for } j = 1, 2\}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}^\nu \subset \mathfrak{g}_k$ for $k = (\nu_1 + \nu_2)/m$ and

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \mathfrak{g}^\nu \quad \text{with} \quad [\mathfrak{g}^\nu, \mathfrak{g}^\mu] \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\nu+\mu}\,,$$

compare also (3.5) in [19]. Clearly $i\partial/\partial z_k \in \mathfrak{g}^{-k,k-m}$ for all $0 \leq k \leq m$. Because of Proposition 4.2.iv it is enough to show $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$. Assume to the contrary that there exists a non-zero $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_1$. Then we may assume without loss of generality that $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^{k,m-k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $c$ be the cardinality of $\{0 \leq j \leq m : [\partial/\partial z_j, \xi] \neq 0\}$. From $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}^{-1,1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{0,0} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{1,-1}$ and $[i\partial/\partial z_j, \xi] \in \mathfrak{g}^{k-j,j-k}$ we see $c \leq 3$. Assume $c = 3$, which implies $0 < k < m$. From $[\partial/\partial z_j, \xi] \neq 0$ for $j = k \pm 1$ and the special form of $\xi^{-1,1}$, $\xi^{1,-1}$ in (5.2) we see that $\xi$ must depend on all $n$ variables, a contradiction to $n > 3$. But $c \leq 2$ also gives a contradiction since in all spaces $\mathfrak{g}^{-1,1}$, $\mathfrak{g}^{0,0}$, $\mathfrak{g}^{1,-1}$ every non-zero vector field must depend on at least $n - 2$ variables. □

Recall that $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ is the group of all global CR-automorphisms and $\mathrm{Aff}(M)$ is the subgroup of all of affine transformations of $M$.

**7.5 Proposition.** *Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ be a trace-free cyclic endomorphism. Then the groups $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ and $\mathrm{Aff}(M)$ coincide. Furthermore, with $n = \dim V$ the following dimension estimates hold.*

(i) $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(M) = n + 4$ *if the characteristic roots of $\varphi$ are pairwise distinct and form an arithmetic progression in $i\mathbb{R}$.*

(ii) $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(M) = n + 3$ *if $\varphi$ is nilpotent.*

(iii) $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(M) = n + 2$ *in all other cases.*

*Proof.* Let $F := M \cap V$ and denote by $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ the Lie algebra of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$. Since $\mathfrak{a}$ contains the Euler vector field we have $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{a}_1$ for $\mathfrak{a}_j := \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{g}_j$. We first determine dim $\mathfrak{a}_0$. Because of $\mathfrak{h} := \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{id} \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi \subset \mathfrak{a}_0$ we have dim $\mathfrak{a}_0 \geq 2$.
In case (i) $M$ is CR-equivalent to $\mathcal{M}^{2,n-2}$, compare Example 5.1. Therefore $\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on $F$ and dim $\mathfrak{a}_0 = 4$ by Proposition 7.3.
Next consider the case (ii), that is, $\varphi$ is nilpotent. Then $\mathfrak{a}_0$ consists of all $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_0 \subset \mathrm{End}(V)$ with $\xi(c) \in \mathbb{R}c$ for all $c \in \partial F := \overline{F} \setminus F$, where $\overline{F}$ is the closure of $F$ in $V$. We may assume that $a = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi = \xi^{1,-1}$ in the notation of (5.2). This implies $F = \{e^s(1, t, t^2, \dots, t^{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^n : s, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and hence $\partial F = \mathbb{R}c$ for $c := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{a}_0$ is the linear span of $\zeta_1$, $\zeta_2$ and $\xi^{1,-1}$ and dim $\mathfrak{a}_0 = 3$ in this situation.
Next consider the case $V = V_1 \oplus V_2 \oplus \dots \oplus V_n$ where every $V_j$ is the $\big((1-n)/2 + (j-1)\big)$ eigenspace of $\varphi$, that is, the characteristic roots of $\varphi$ form an arithmetic progression in $\mathbb{R}$. Here $\partial F = V_1 \cup V_n$ is easily verified. The vector fields in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ are characterized by the function tuples $(r_0, r_1)$ in (7.4). The condition $\xi(V_j) \subset V_j$ for $j = 1, n$ implies that $r_0, r_1$ are constant for every $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}_0$, that is $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$. On the other hand, if the characteristic roots of $\varphi$ do not form an arithmetic progression, then also $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$ by Proposition 6.5.i, that is, dim $\mathfrak{a}_0 = 2$ always holds in case (iii).
Next we show $\mathfrak{a}_1 = 0$ in all cases: For $n \geq 4$ this follows from $\mathfrak{g}_1 = 0$, see Proposition 7.3.ii. In case (iii) we have $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$ and the claim follows with Lemma 6.18. Therefore we only have to consider the cases (i) and (ii) for $n = 3$. In case (i) $M$ is the future light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{Aff}(\mathcal{M})$ follows as a special case of Proposition 6.9 in [26]. In case (ii) $M$ is a proper domain in $\mathcal{M}$: We realize $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F} + i\mathbb{R}^3$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$ with coordinates $(z_0, z_1, z_2)$ as $\mathcal{F} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_0x_2 = x_1^2 \text{ and } x_0 + x_2 > 0\}$. Then $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M})$ is the linear span of the vector fields (3.5) and (3.7) in [19]. We may assume without loss of generality that $\varphi = \xi^{-1,1} = 2z_1\,\partial/\partial z_0 + z_2\,\partial/\partial z_1$. This implies $\mathcal{M} \setminus M = \mathbb{R}^+ \cdot c + i\mathbb{R}^3$ for $c := (1, 0, 0) \in \mathcal{F}$. We know already that $\mathfrak{a}$ is the linear span of the vector fields $\zeta_1$, $\zeta_1$ and $\xi^{-1,1}$. From Figure 1 and (3.7) in [19] we therefore derive that either $\mathfrak{a}_1 = 0$ or $\mathfrak{a}_1 = \mathbb{R}\xi^{0,2}$ for $\xi^{0,2} := iz_1^2\,\partial/\partial z_0 + iz_1z_2\,\partial/\partial z_1 + iz_2^2\,\partial/\partial z_2$. The latter possibility cannot occur since $\xi^{0,2}$ is not tangent to $\mathcal{M} \setminus M$: Check, for instance, the point $(1, i, 0)$. This proves $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0$ in all cases. As in the proof of Proposition 4.4.iii it is shown that this implies $\mathrm{Aut}(M) = \mathrm{Aff}(M)$. The above dimension estimates for $\mathfrak{a}_0$ imply the dimension estimates in (i) – (iii). □

Next we solve the local as well as the global CR-equivalence problem for all manifolds $M^\varphi$. Because of Proposition 7.1 in the local situation only the case has to be considered where the characteristic roots of $\varphi$ do not form an arithmetic progression. Recall that without loss of generality we always may assume that $\varphi$ is trace-free.

**7.6 Proposition.** *Let $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ be trace-free cyclic endomorphisms with characteristic roots $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_n$ respectively. Suppose that the $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ do not form an arithmetic progression. Then for given cyclic vectors $a, a' \in V$ and corresponding $M = M^\varphi$, $M' = M^{\varphi'}$ the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ and $\mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$ coincide. Furthermore, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(i) *The Lie algebras $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ and $\mathfrak{hol}(M', a)$ are isomorphic .*
(ii) *The germs $(M, a)$ and $(M', a')$ are CR-equivalent.*
(iii) *$g\varphi' g^{-1} = r\varphi$ for suitable $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^*$.*
(iv) *There exists a permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and an $r \in \mathbb{R}^*$ with $\alpha'_j = r\alpha_{\pi(j)}$ for all $j$.*

*Proof.* $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M, a) = \mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$ and dim $\mathfrak{g} = n + 2$ follows from Propositions 6.5 and 6.17.
(i) ⇒ (ii) With $\mathfrak{g}$ also $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{hol}(M', a')$ has dimension $n + 2$. Therefore also $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_n$ do not form an arithmetic progression, see Proposition 7.3. This implies $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$, $\mathfrak{g}'_0 = \mathfrak{h}'$ and (ii) follows with Proposition 4.11.
(ii) ⇒ (iii) Let $g$ be a CR-isomorphism $(M, a) \to (M', a')$. Then $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ as a consequence of Proposition 4.4.iii. and clearly $g\mathfrak{h}g^{-1} = \mathfrak{h}'$. Since $\mathbb{R}\varphi' \subset \mathfrak{h}'$ is precisely the subset of all trace-free endomorphisms (iv) follows.
The remaining implications are easy to check and left to the reader. □

**7.7 Proposition.** *Let* $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ *be trace-free cyclic endomorphisms and* $M := M^{\varphi}$, $M' := M^{\varphi'}$. *Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(i) *The groups* $\mathrm{Aff}(M)$ *and* $\mathrm{Aff}(M')$ *are isomorphic.*

(ii) $M$ *and* $M'$ *are globally CR-equivalent.*

(iii) $g\varphi' g^{-1} = r\varphi$ *for suitable* $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ *and* $r \in \mathbb{R}^*$.

*Proof.* (i) ⇒ (iii) Suppose that (i) holds. Because of Proposition 7.5 we may assume $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(M) = n+2$ without loss of generality. Then (iii) follows from Proposition 7.6 if at least for one of the $\varphi, \varphi'$ the characteristic roots do not form an arithmetic progression. In the remaining cases the claim follows from Proposition 7.5 since for both endomorphisms the characteristic roots form an arithmetic progression in $\mathbb{R}$ and are pairwise distinct.

(iii) ⇒ (ii) ⇒ (i) is obvious since $\mathrm{Aut}(M) = \mathrm{Aff}(M)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(M') = \mathrm{Aff}(M')$ by Proposition 7.5. ☐

**7.8 Some moduli spaces.** For fixed $n = \dim V$ let $\mathscr{M}$ be the space of all global CR-equivalence classes $[M^{\varphi}]$ of manifolds $M^{\varphi}$ with $\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(V)$, that is, every $[M^{\varphi}]$ is the set of all $M^{\psi}$ that are globally CR-equivalent to $M^{\varphi}$. Furthermore put

$$\Phi := \{\varphi \in \mathrm{Cyc}(V) : \mathrm{tr}(\varphi) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{M}^* := \big\{[M^{\varphi}] \in \mathscr{M} : \varphi \in \Phi,\ \varphi^n \neq 0\big\}\,.$$

The reductive group $\mathbb{R}^* \times \mathrm{GL}(V)$ acts on $\mathrm{End}(V)$ by $\varphi \mapsto rg\varphi g^{-1}$ for every $(r, g) \in \mathbb{R}^* \times \mathrm{GL}(V)$ and leaves the cone $\Phi$ invariant. By Proposition 7.7 $\mathscr{M}$ can be identified as set with the quotient $\Phi/(\mathbb{R}^* \times \mathrm{GL}(V))$. This quotient can be built in several steps: For every $j$ let $\sigma_j(\varphi) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the $j^{\text{th}}$ elementary symmetric function in $n$ variables evaluated on the characteristic roots of $\varphi$, that is,

$$X^n + \sum_{j=2}^{n} (-1)^j \sigma_j(\varphi) X^{n-j} \ \in\ \mathbb{R}[X]$$

is the characteristic polynomial of $\varphi \in \Phi$. Let $W := \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ with coordinates $(x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ and denote by $\sigma : \Phi \to W$ the mapping given by $\varphi \mapsto (\sigma_2(\varphi), \ldots, \sigma_n(\varphi))$. Since every real polynomial factors in a product of linear and quadratic real polynomials, the map $\sigma$ is surjective and $\mathscr{M}$ can be canonically identified as set with the quotient $W/\mathbb{R}^*$, where $\mathbb{R}^*$ acts on $W$ by $(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto (t^2x_2, t^3x_3, \ldots, t^nx_n)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^*$. The subgroup $\{\pm 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^*$ leaves the sphere $S^{n-2} = \{x \in W : \sum x_j^2 = 1\}$ invariant and $\mathscr{M}^*$ can be identified with the quotient $Q^{n-2} := S^{n-2}/\{\pm 1\}$. In general, $Q^{n-2}$ can be stratified into a finite number of manifolds. For instance, $Q^1$ is a compact line segment and $Q^2$ is homeomorphic to the sphere $S^2$. At this point a word of caution is necessary: We do not give a topology to $\mathscr{M}$, the topology on $Q^{n-2}$ only serves for the readers imagination.

Instead of $\mathscr{M}$ we can also consider the space of *local* CR-equivalence classes for manifolds of type $M^{\varphi}$. By our results this space is of the form $\mathscr{M}/\!\sim$, where the equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\mathscr{M}$ just identifies the 3 equivalence classes $[M^{\varphi}] \in \mathscr{M}$ such that the characteristic roots of $\varphi$ form an arithmetic progression. Clearly, $\mathscr{M}/\!\sim\, = \mathscr{M}^*/\!\sim$ can be obtained by identifying two points in $Q^{n-2}$. In the spacial case $n = 3$ the endpoints of the line segment $Q^1$ have to be identified, that is, $\mathscr{M}$ can be thought of in this case as the circle $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \infty$ (without topology) where the point $\infty$ corresponds to the class represented by the future light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$. To be more specific, call in case $n = 3$ for every $\varphi \in \Phi$

$$\mu\big(M^{\varphi}\big) := -\frac{\sigma_2(\varphi)^3}{\sigma_3(\varphi)^2} \ \in\ \overline{\mathbb{R}} \tag{7.9}$$

the *modulus* of the CR-manifold $M^{\varphi}$ (with $t/0 := \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$). It is clear that $M^{\varphi}$ and $M^{\psi}$ in case $n = 3$ are locally CR-equivalent if and only if they have the same modulus. A special meaning has the modulus $\mu_0 := 27/4$: For real moduli $> \mu_0$ the endomorphism $\varphi$ has 3 distinct real eigenvalues while in case of real moduli $< \mu_0$ the endomorphism $\varphi$ has one real and two purely imaginary eigenvalues.

**7.10 Another type of examples.** For $k = 3$ and $c \geq 1$ let $V,\ \Gamma = \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{R})^0$ and $a = u_2^m + u_1 u_2^{m-1} \in V$ be as in Example 5.1. Consider the subgroup

$$\Sigma := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ \beta & 1 \end{pmatrix} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \ \subset\ \Gamma\,. \tag{7.11}$$

Then $F := \Sigma(a)$ is a homogeneous surface in $V$. For $o := u_2^m$ the orbit $C := \Sigma(o)$ is a homogeneous curve. Identify $V$ and $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ with coordinates $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ as in Example 5.1. Then $a = (1,1,0,\ldots,0)$, $o = (1,0,\ldots,0) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ and the Lie algebra of $\Sigma$ corresponds to the linear span of the two vector fields $\zeta_1$ and $\xi^{1,-1}$ in (5.2). In particular

$$C = \{(1, t, t^2, \ldots, t^m) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

and $T_oC = \mathbb{R}{\cdot}b$ with $b := (0,1,0,\ldots,0)$ for the tangent space at $o \in C$. On the other hand, the affine halfline $o + \mathbb{R}^+{\cdot}b$ is contained in $F$. The geometric meaning of this is the following: The development $S := \bigcup_{c\in C}(c + T_cC)$ of the curve $C$ is divided by $C$ in two $\Sigma$-orbits, one of which is $F$ (compare [15], p. 45 for the special case $m = 3$). Now identify the $\Sigma$-invariant hyperplane $W := \{x \in V : x_0 = 1\}$ with $\mathbb{R}^m$ by 'dropping the coordinate' $x_0$. Then $C$ becomes the twisted $m$-ic $\{(t, t^2, \ldots, t^m) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, $o$ becomes the origin and $a$ the first basis vector $(1,0,\ldots,0)$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$. In the coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^m$ the vector fields $\zeta_1$ and $\xi^{1,-1}$ are affine and have the forms

$$\zeta_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} j z_j \,\partial/\partial z_j \quad\text{and}\quad \xi^{1,-1} = \partial/\partial z_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{m} j z_{j-1}\,\partial/\partial z_j\,. \tag{7.12}$$

With Proposition 3.7 it is easily verified that $K_a^r F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : x_j = 0 \ \text{ if } \ j + r > 2\}$ for all $r \geq 0$. Since the twisted $m$-ic is not contained in any hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^m$ we therefore get that the tube $M := C + i\mathbb{R}^m$ is a homogeneous minimal 2-nondegenerate submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^m$ with CR-dimension 2 and CR-codimension $m-2$. Notice that for the cone $\mathbb{R}^+{\cdot}F$ generated by $F$ in $V$ the tube $\mathbb{R}^+{\cdot}F + iV$ is an open piece of $\mathcal{M}^{3,n-3}$, $n := m + 1$, and hence is 3-nondegenerate.
Denote for every integer $j$ by $\mathfrak{g}^{(j)}$ the $k$-eigenspace of $\mathrm{ad}(\zeta_1)$ in $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$. Then every $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^{(j)}$ is a complex linear combination of monomial vector fields $z_1^{\nu_1} z_2^{\nu_2} \cdots z_m^{\nu_m}\,\partial/\partial z_p$ with $\nu_1 + 2\nu_2 + \ldots + m\nu_m = j + p$. As in the proof of Proposition 4.2, it is shown that $\mathfrak{g}$ has the $\mathbb{Z}$-gradation

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{j\geq -m} \mathfrak{g}^{(j)}\,. \tag{7.13}$$

It can be seen that $\mathfrak{g}$ is the linear span of all $i\partial/\partial z_j$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, as well as $\zeta_1$ and $\xi^{1,-1}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{g}$ is a solvable Lie algebra of dimension $m + 2$, coincides with $\mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$ and has commutator subgroup of dimension $m + 1$. A proof will be sketched for the special case $m = 3$ in Example 8.5.

## 8. Homogeneous 2-nondegenerate CR-manifolds in dimension 5

In this section we specialize the examples of the previous section to the case $V = \mathbb{R}^3$. We start with manifolds of type $M = M^\varphi = F^\varphi + i\mathbb{R}^3$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$, Then the local CR-equivalence classes of these manifolds are parameterized by the modules $\mu(M) \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, compare (7.9). The $\varphi$ occurring in the following examples not necessarily are trace-free but easily could be transformed to. As defined in the previous section let $\mu_0 := 27/4$.

**8.1 Example. ($\mu = \infty$)** Let $F := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1^2 + x_2^2 = x_3^2,\ x_3 > 0\}$ be the future light cone. This surface occurs as $F^\varphi$ for $\varphi := x_2\,\partial/\partial x_1 - x_1\,\partial/\partial x_2$ having spectrum $\{\pm i, 0\}$.

**8.2 Example. ($\mu < \mu_0$)** For $\omega > 0$ let $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be the orbit of $(1,0,1)$ under the group of all linear transformations $x \mapsto r(\cos t\, x_1 - \sin t\, x_2, \sin t\, x_1 + \cos t\, x_2, e^{\omega t} x_3)$, $r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}$.
With $r := (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^{1/2}$, the manifold $F$ is given in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r > 0\}$ by the explicit equations

$$x_3 = r\exp\left(\omega\cos^{-1}(x_1/r)\right) = r\exp\left(\omega\sin^{-1}(x_2/r)\right),$$

where locally always one of these suffices. A suitable choice is $\varphi = x_1 {\partial}/{\partial x_2} - x_2 {\partial}/{\partial x_1} + \omega x_3 {\partial}/{\partial x_3}$ with spectrum $\{\pm i, \omega\}$.

**8.3 Example. ($\mu = \mu_0$)** Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be the orbit of $(1, 0, 1)$ under the group of all linear transformations $x \mapsto r(x_1, x_2 + tx_1, e^t x_3)$ with $r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}$, that is,

$$F = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 > 0,\ x_3 = x_1 e^{x_2/x_1}\right\}.$$

Here $\varphi = x_1 {\partial}/{\partial x_2} + x_3 {\partial}/{\partial x_3}$ has characteristic roots $0, 0, 1$.

**8.4 Example. ($\mu > \mu_0$)** For $\theta > 2$ let

$$F := \{x \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^3 : x_3 = x_1(x_2/x_1)^\theta\}.$$

Here $\varphi = x_2 {\partial}/{\partial x_2} + \omega x_3 {\partial}/{\partial x_3}$ has eigenvalues $\{0, 1, \omega\}$.

The following is Example 7.10 specialized to $m = 3$.

**8.5 Example.** Let $\Sigma$ be the group generated by the following two one-parameter groups

$$(8.6) \qquad x \mapsto (e^t x_1, e^{2t} x_2, e^{3t} x_3), \qquad x \mapsto (x_1 + t, x_2 + 2tx_1 + t^2, x_3 + 3tx_2 + 3t^2 x_1 + t^3)$$

of affine transformations on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then $\Sigma$ is isomorphic to the group defined in (7.11). For $a := (1, 0, 0)$ the orbit $F := \Gamma(a)$ is

$$F \;=\; \{(t, t^2, t^3) + r(1, 2t, 3t^2) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : r \in \mathbb{R}^+, t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The tube $M := F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ is an affinely homogeneous 2-nondegenerate CR-manifold. The Lie algebra of $\Sigma$ is spanned by the affine vector fields

$$\zeta_1 := z_1 {\partial}/{\partial z_1} + 2z_2 {\partial}/{\partial z_2} + 3z_3 {\partial}/{\partial z_3} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi^{1,-1} := {\partial}/{\partial z_1} + z_1 {\partial}/{\partial z_2} + z_2 {\partial}/{\partial z_3},$$

compare also (7.12). The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ is of finite dimension and has the gradation (7.13) for $m = 3$, where $\mathfrak{g}^{(k)}$ is the $k$-eigenspace of $\mathrm{ad}(\zeta_1)$. We claim that $\mathfrak{g}$ has dimension 5 and coincides with $\mathfrak{aff}(M, a)$. The proof consists of several elementary steps which we only sketch here. To begin with, define $\mathfrak{a}^{(k)} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{(k)}$ by

$$\mathfrak{a}^{(-3)} := \mathbb{R}\, i{\partial}/{\partial z_3},\ \mathfrak{a}^{(-2)} := \mathbb{R} i{\partial}/{\partial z_2},\ \mathfrak{a}^{(-1)} := \mathbb{R} i{\partial}/{\partial z_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}\varphi,\ \mathfrak{a}^{(0)} := \mathbb{R}\zeta$$

and $\mathfrak{a}^{(k)} := 0$ for all other $k$. By induction on $k$ it is seen that $\mathfrak{g}^{(k)} = \mathfrak{a}^{(k)}$ holds for all $k$: For $k \le -3$ this is obvious. For $k = -2$ suppose there exists a $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^{(-2)} \setminus \mathfrak{a}^{(-2)}$. Then $\xi = \alpha{\partial}/{\partial z_2} + \beta z_1 {\partial}/{\partial z_3}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. From $[\xi, \mathfrak{a}^{(-1)}] \subset \mathfrak{a}^{(-3)}$ we get $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and then $\xi_a \in T_a M$ implies $\beta = 0$. But then $\xi \in \mathfrak{a}^{(-2)}$ since $\mathfrak{a}^{(-2)} \oplus i\mathfrak{a}^{(-2)} \not\subset \mathfrak{g}^{(-2)}$, a contradiction. For $k \ge -1$ the procedure is as follows. Suppose there exists a $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^{(k)} \setminus \mathfrak{a}^{(k)}$. Then write $\xi$ as complex linear combination of monomial vector fields as mentioned above and subtract from $\xi$ a suitable element of $\mathfrak{a}^{(k)}$ thus killing as many coefficients in front of monomial terms of the form $f(z){\partial}/{\partial z_1}$ as possible. By induction hypothesis $[\mathfrak{g}^{(k)}, \mathfrak{a}^{(j)}] \subset \mathfrak{a}^{(k+j)}$ holds for all $j < 0$ and gives $\xi = 0$, a contradiction. This proves the claim and also the first part of the following statement.

**8.7 Lemma.** *Let* $M := F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ *for* $F = H(a) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *as in Example* 8.5. *Then* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ *is a solvable Lie algebra of dimension* 5 *with commutator algebra* $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ *of dimension* 4. *Furthermore,* $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a) = \{\mathrm{id}\}$.

*Proof.* Fix $a := (1, 0, 0) \in F$ and write $\xi_j := i{\partial}/{\partial z_j}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Let $h \in \mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ and $\Theta$ the induced Lie algebra automorphism of $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$. With $\mathfrak{g}$ the subspaces

$$\mathfrak{n} := [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \bigoplus_{k<0} \mathfrak{g}^{(k)}, \qquad [\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{n}] = \mathbb{R}\xi_2 \oplus \mathbb{R}\xi_3 \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathfrak{n}, [\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{n}]] = \mathbb{R}\xi_3$$

are stable under $\Theta$ and hence also

$$\mathfrak{n} \cap K_a M = \mathbb{R}\xi_1 \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{n}] \cap H_a M = \mathbb{R}\xi_2 \,,$$

where $\mathfrak{g}$ and the tangent space $T_aM$ are identified via the evaluation map. In particular, $\Theta(\mathfrak{P}_{-1}) = \mathfrak{P}_{-1}$ and $h(z) = g(z) + c$ for a diagonal matrix $g \in \mathrm{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ with $c = g(a) - a$, compare (2.1). Taking commutators of $h$ with all elements in the second 1-parameter group of (8.6) and then taking the derivative by $t$ at $t = 0$ gives $c\partial/\partial z \in \mathfrak{g}$. From $\mathfrak{g} \cap i\mathfrak{g} = 0$ we conclude $c = 0$ and thus $g_{11} = 1$ for the diagonal matrix $g$. Now $\psi$ is the unique vector field in $\mathfrak{g}$ that has the value $\partial/\partial z$ at both points $0, a$, implying $\Theta(\psi) = \psi$. Therefore $g$ is the unit matrix and $h$ is the identity in $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$. ☐

For every $M = F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ with $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ a cone from Example 8.1 – 8.4 the commutator of $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ has either dimension 10 (Example 8.1) or dimension 3 (all the others). As a consequence of Proposition 7.6 and Lemma 8.7 we therefore get:

**8.8 Proposition.** *The CR-manifolds $M = F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ with $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ occurring in the examples* 8.1 – 8.5*, are all homogeneous and* 2*-nondegenerate. Furthermore, they are mutually locally CR-inequivalent.*

With an argument from [19] together with 2.5.10 in [24] a holomorphic extension property for *global* continuous CR-functions $f$ on $M = F \oplus i\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$, $F$ one of the cones from examples 8.1 – 8.5, can be obtained: Every such $f$ has a unique continuous extension to the convex hull $\hat{M}$ of $M$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$ that is holomorphic on the interior of $\hat{M}$ with respect $\mathbb{C}^3$. Since $M$ is completely contained in the interior of $\hat{M}$ in case $F$ belongs to Example 8.2, every global continuous CR-function on such an $M$ is real-analytic.

For the tube $\mathcal{M}$ over the future light cone (that is Example 8.1) there exist many (even simply-connected) homogeneous CR-manifolds that are all locally CR-equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$ but are mutually non-diffeomorphic, compare [26]. In contrast to this, using already Theorem II from Section 9, we can state the following global result:

**8.9 Proposition.** *Let $M$ be a homogeneous* 2*-nondegenerate CR-manifold that is not locally CR-equivalent to the tube $\mathcal{M}$ over the future light cone. Then $M$ is simply connected and* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *is a solvable Lie group of dimension 5 acting transitively and freely on $M$. For every $a \in M$ the stability group* $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ *is trivial and every homogeneous real-analytic CR-manifold $M'$, that is locally CR-equivalent to $M$, is already globally CR-equivalent to $M$.*

*Proof.* By Theorem II $M = F + iV$ for $F$ as in one of the examples 8.2 – 8.5. It is easily checked that $F$ and hence $M$ is simply connected. In case $F$ is a cone, the claim follows with Lemma 6.20. Therefore we may assume that $F$ is the submanifold of Example 8.5. But then $\mathrm{Aut}(M, a)$ is the trivial group by Lemma 8.7 and $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ has trivial center by Proposition 3.9. But then the claim follows from Proposition 3.10. ☐

The affinely homogeneous surfaces $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of examples 8.1 – 8.5 occur already in [15] p. 43. There the surfaces are presented in their affine normal forms: Our Example 8.1 ($\mu = \infty$) corresponds to P4, the Examples 8.2 – 8.4 ($\mu \in \mathbb{R}$) to P3 and Example 8.5 to P1. The remaining degenerate types in [15], types P2$^{\pm}$ and P5, do not show up among our examples since the associated tube manifolds are holomorphically degenerate.

Let us consider the type P3 in [15] p. 43 a little bit closer. This is the family of local surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ given by the local equations in affine normal form

$$x_3 = x_1^2 + x_1^2 x_2 + x_1^2 x_2^2 + x_1^5 + x_1^2 x_2^3 + 4x_1^5 x_2 + x_1^2 x_2^4 + a x_1^7 + 10 x_1^5 x_2^2 + x_1^2 x_2^5 + \mathrm{O}(8), \tag{8.10}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary parameter and O(8) for every fixed $a$ is a convergent power series in $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ vanishing of order $\geq 8$ at the origin and uniquely determined by the requirement, that (8.10) defines near the origin of $\mathbb{R}^3$ a locally affinely homogeneous surface. Different values of $a \in \mathbb{R}$ give locally affinely inequivalent surfaces and there tubes in $\mathbb{C}^3$ correspond in a 1-1-way to our Examples 8.2 – 8.4. It is not difficult to see that the modulus $\mu$ of every such surface is related to the parameter $a$ in (8.10) by the formula $100\mu = (28a)^3$.

In [14], [15] all locally affinely homogeneous surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ have been classified up to local affine equivalence. Inspecting the degenerate surfaces in these classifications gives together with our results the following

**8.11 Proposition.** *Let $F$ be a locally affinely homogeneous surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and assume that the corresponding tube $M := F + i\mathbb{R}^3$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$ is 2-nondegenerate. Then*

(i) *$M$ is locally CR-equivalent to a manifold occurring in the Examples 8.1 – 8.5, and*

(ii) *for every further locally affinely homogeneous surface $F'$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ the corresponding tubes $M$ and $M' := F' + i\mathbb{R}^3$ are locally CR-equivalent if and only if $F$ and $F'$ are locally affinely equivalent.*

# PART 2: The classification

## 9. Lie-theoretic characterization of locally homogeneous CR-manifolds

In this part of the paper we classify all homogeneous 5-dimensional 2-nondegenerate CR-manifolds up to local CR-equivalence, that is, we carry out the proof of

**Theorem II.** *Let $M$ be a locally homogeneous 2-nondegenerate real-analytic CR-manifold of dimension 5. Then $M$ is locally CR-equivalent to a tube $F + i\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$, where $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is one of the affinely homogeneous surfaces occurring in the Examples 8.1 – 8.5.*

We call (in accordance with Section 2) a real-analytic CR-manifold $M$ *locally homogeneous* at a point $o \in M$ if there exists a Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(M, o)$ of finite dimension such that the canonical evaluation map $\mathfrak{g} \to T_oM$ is surjective, that is, such that the tangent vectors $\xi_o$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$, span the tangent space $T_oM$. If this is the case we also call the corresponding CR-germ $(M, o)$ *locally homogeneous.* If a particular locally transitive $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(M, o)$ has been fixed we also say that the germ $(M, o)$ is $\mathfrak{g}$-homogeneous.

The proof of Theorem II relies on a natural equivalence (see [18], Prop. 4.1) between the category of CR-manifold germs with a locally transitive Lie algebra action and a certain purely algebraically defined category. Before we briefly outline the main steps of our proof, we recall the notion of a CR-algebra, taken from [30], and introduce some notation.

**9.1 Definition.** A CR-algebra is a pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a real Lie algebra of *finite* dimension and $\mathfrak{q}$ is a complex Lie subalgebra of the complexification $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$. The CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is called *effective* if 0 is the only ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$ contained in $\mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{q}$.

**9.2 Remarks.**

(i) In [30] also the case is allowed where $\mathfrak{g}$ has infinite dimension, but $\mathfrak{q}$ has to have finite codimension in $\mathfrak{l}$. In this part of the paper however, only finite-dimensional Lie algebras occur.

(ii) The CR-algebras form in an obvious way a category: A morphism $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}) \to (\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{q}')$ of CR-algebras is a Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}'$ in the usual sense whose complex linear extension $\mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{l}'$ maps $\mathfrak{q}$ to $\mathfrak{q}'$. Unfortunately, the resulting notion of isomorphism between CR-algebras is too strict for our purposes. We therefore mainly work with the coarser notion of geometric equivalence between CR-algebras to be introduced later.

(iii) The geometric situation behind the notion of a CR-algebra is the following: Let $Z$ be a complex manifold homogeneous under a complex Lie group $L$, let $o \in Z$ be a point with isotropy subgroup $Q \subset L$ at $o$ and $G \subset L$ a connected real form of $L$, that is, the connected identity component of the fixed point set $L^\sigma$ for an involutive antiholomorphic automorphism $\sigma$ of $L$. Then each $G$–orbit $M$

in $Z$ is a generic (immersed) CR-submanifold. Let $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}$ be the Lie algebras of $G$ and $Q$, respectively. Then $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is a CR-algebra that completely describes the CR-germ $(M, o)$ together with the local action of $G$ near $o$.

(iv) In general, however, not every CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ can be obtained from a global situation as described in (iii), only from a more general local setting. Nevertheless, the set $\mathcal{G}$ of all CR-equivalence classes of locally homogeneous CR-germs and the set $\mathcal{A}$ of all geometric equivalence classes of CR-algebras stand in a canonical 1-1-correspondence, compare also Section 4 in [18]. For convenience of the reader, we briefly describe below this correspondence in both directions. As a reference for a general discussion of 'local' and 'infinitesimal' actions we refer to the original paper of Palais, [31].

In the following let $M$ always be a locally homogeneous real-analytic CR-manifold with base point $o \in M$ that *locally* can be embedded in some $\mathbb{C}^n$ (equivalently, $M$ is an (abstract) real-analytic *involutive* CR-manifold as defined at the end of Section 2). Each such CR-manifold can globally and generically be embedded into a complex manifold $Z$ [1]. Since we are only interested in the local structure of $M$ at $o$ and therefore mostly deal with CR-germs $(M, o)$, we may assume without loss of generality that $M$ is embedded in a complex vector space $E \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ as a locally closed generic CR-submanifold.

Next we describe the interplay between locally homogeneous CR-germs and CR-algebras more closely. In particular, we give two canonical constructions that induce the 1-1-correspondence between the sets $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ mentioned in 9.2.iv and also allow the precise definition of 'geometric equivalence' for CR-algebras:

Let $(M, o)$ be a CR-germ and $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(M, o)$ a locally transitive Lie subalgebra of finite dimension. Then an effective CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ can be associated in the following way: To begin with, realize $\mathfrak{hol}(M, o)$ in the canonical way as real Lie subalgebra of the complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(E, o)$. This is possible, since we assumed $M$ to be generic in $E$ and we can use Proposition 12.4.22 in [5]. As in Definition 9.1 we always denote by $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ the formal complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$. Now $\Xi(\xi + i\eta) := \xi + J\eta$ defines a Lie algebra homomorphism $\Xi : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{hol}(E, o)$, where $J$ denotes the complex structure tensor $J : TE \to TE$. We will not make a notational distinction between the complex structures in $\mathfrak{l}$ or $TZ$, and write '$i$' for it. The homomorphism $\Xi$ is in general not injective (it is, if $M$ is holomorphically nondegenerate). Let $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ be the $\Xi$-preimage of the isotropy subalgebra $\{\xi \in \mathfrak{hol}(E, o) : \xi_o = 0\}$. Then the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is called a *CR-algebra associated* to the locally homogeneous CR-germ $(M, o)$. It is obvious that $\mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{q}$ is nothing but the isotropy subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_o = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g} : \xi_o = 0\}$ and the tangent space $T_oM$ can be canonically identified with $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_o$. Also the holomorphic tangent space $H_oM$ and the partial complex structure $J : H_oM \to H_oM$ (equivalently: the decomposition $H_o^{1,0}M \oplus H_o^{0,1}M$ of the complexification $H_o^{\mathbb{C}}M = H_oM \otimes \mathbb{C}$) can be read off the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$: Let $\sigma$ be the conjugate linear involution of $\mathfrak{l}$ with $\mathfrak{l}^\sigma := \mathrm{Fix}(\sigma) = \mathfrak{g}$. Then it is easily verified that $\mathfrak{H} := (\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q})^\sigma$ coincides with $\{\xi \in \mathfrak{g} : \xi_o \in iT_oM\}$, that is, $\mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{g}_o$ is canonically isomorphic to $H_oM$ (the capital letter for $\mathfrak{H}$ is chosen to indicate that $\mathfrak{H}$ in general is not a Lie algebra, only a linear subspace). Further, $H_o^{0,1}M = \mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}\cap\sigma\mathfrak{q}$ and $H_o^{1,0}M = \sigma\mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}\cap\sigma\mathfrak{q}$. In [18] it has been shown that the geometric properties of the CR-structure of the CR-germ $(M, o)$ like minimality, $k$-nondegeneracy, holomorphic degeneracy can be read off every CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ associated with $(M, o)$. The facts relevant for our classification will be discussed below.

There is also a canonical way to associate a locally homogeneous CR-manifold germ $(M, o)$ to a given CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ (not necessarily effective): Choose a complex Lie group $L$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ and a complex linear subspace $E \subset \mathfrak{l}$ with $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{q} \oplus E$. Then there exist open neighbourhoods $U$ of $0 \in E$, $V$ of $0 \in \mathfrak{q}$ and $R$ of $\mathrm{id} \in L$ such that $(u, v) \mapsto \exp(u)\exp(v)$ defines a biholomorphic mapping $\varphi : U \times V \to R$. Choose an open neighbourhood $P$ of $0 \in \mathfrak{g}$ with $\exp(P) \subset R$. Then, in our particular situation, with $\pi : U \times V \to U$ being the canonical projection, the mapping $\psi := \pi \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \exp : P \to U$ has constant rank. Without loss of generality we therefore may assume that $M := \psi(P)$ is a connected real-analytic submanifold of $E$ containing the origin $0 \in E$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}$ can be identified with the Lie algebra of all right-invariant vector fields on $L$ and every $\xi \in \mathfrak{l}$ can be projected along $\pi \circ \varphi^{-1} : R \to U$ to a holomorphic vector field $\widetilde{\xi} \in \mathfrak{hol}(U)$. Thus the real subalgebra $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} := \{\widetilde{\xi} : \xi \in \mathfrak{g}\} \subset \mathfrak{hol}(U)$ is a homomorphic image of $\mathfrak{g}$ and spans at every $x \in M$ the tangent space $T_xM$. In particular, $M$ is a generic CR-submanifold of $E$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a locally transitive subalgebra. It is not difficult so see that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is obtained from $\mathfrak{g}$ by factoring out the kernel of ineffectivity, more precisely, let $\mathfrak{j}$ be the largest ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathfrak{j} \subset \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{q}$. Then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{j}$. If there exists a Lie group $L$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}$ such that the subalgebra $\mathfrak{q}$ corresponds to a *closed* complex subgroup $Q \subset L$ then we may take $L/Q$ for $U$ and the $G$–orbit through $[Q] \in L/Q$ for $M$. We call $(M, o)$ the CR-*germ associated* to the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$.

**9.3 Definition.** The CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ and $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{q}')$ are called *geometrically equivalent* if the associated CR-germs are CR-equivalent.

Notice that CR-algebras are always geometrically equivalent if they are isomorphic in the categorical sense of 9.2.ii, but not conversely in general. Notice also that every CR-algebra is geometrically equivalent to an effective one. In the following paragraphs 9.4–9.8, we fix

*for the rest of the paper*

the basic setup and notation, which are mainly taken from [18]:

**9.4 Notation.** Given a CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$, let $(M, o)$ be the associated CR-germ. Write $\mathfrak{l} := \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ for the complexification and $\sigma : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{l}$ for the complex conjugation with $\mathfrak{l}^{\sigma} = \mathfrak{g}$. Then

- (i) $\mathfrak{g}_o := \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{q}$ is called the *real isotropy subalgebra.* Define $\mathfrak{l}_o := \mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)} := \mathfrak{q} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ and note that $\mathfrak{l}_o$ is the complexification $(\mathfrak{g}_o)^{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathfrak{g}_o$.
- (ii) $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_o$ and $\mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_o$ for $\mathfrak{H} := (\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q})^{\sigma} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ are called the *real* and the *holomorphic tangent space* respectively.
- (iii) The descending chain $\mathfrak{q}^{(0)} \supset \mathfrak{q}^{(1)} \supset \mathfrak{q}^{(2)} \supset \cdots \supset \mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)}$ of complex subalgebras is inductively defined by $\mathfrak{q}^{(0)} := \mathfrak{q}$, $\mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)} := \mathfrak{q} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathfrak{q}^{(k+1)} := \{w \in \mathfrak{q}^{(k)} : [w, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{q}^{(k)} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}\}$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $(M, o)$ is the manifold germ associated to the CR-algebra in 9.4 then the holomorphic tangent space $\mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}_o$ in the sense of (ii) can be canonically identified with the holomorphic tangent space $H_oM$ in the geometric sense. As shown in [18], the mapping $\mathfrak{q} \to \mathfrak{H}$, $w \mapsto w + \sigma w$, induces a complex linear isomorphism $\mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)} \cong \mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{g}_o$. The former quotient is canonically isomorphic to $H_o^{0,1}M$ (similarly, $H_o^{1,0}M \cong \sigma\mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)}$). The Levi kernel $K_oM$ and its higher order analogues $K_o^rM$ can be considered as complex linear subspaces of $\mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)}$. We will make extensive use of some of the main results of [18], such as Theorem 5.10:

**9.5 Algebraic characterization of *k*-nondegeneracy.** For every $r \geq 0$ the space $\mathfrak{q}^{(r)}$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{q}$ and the $r^{\text{th}}$ Levi kernel $K_o^rM$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{q}^{(r)}/\mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)}$. In particular, for every $k \geq 1$ the locally homogeneous CR-manifold $M$ is $k$-nondegenerate if and only if

$$\mathfrak{q}^{(k-1)} \neq \mathfrak{q}^{(k)} = \mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)}.$$

To handle the 5-dimensional case we also introduce the following abbreviations

- (iv) $\mathfrak{f} := \mathfrak{q}^{(1)} = \{v \in \mathfrak{q} : [v, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}\}$ and $\mathfrak{F} := (\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f})^{\sigma}$.

Then $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{F} \subset \mathfrak{H} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ are real subspaces stable under $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ and $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ are complex subalgebras. In Lemma 5.9. of [18] it has been shown that actually $\mathfrak{F}$ is a Lie algebra and coincides with $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{H}) \cap \mathfrak{H}$ (here, given $W \subset \mathfrak{g}$, $N_{\mathfrak{g}}(W) := \{v \in \mathfrak{g} : [v, W] \subset W\}$).

Summarizing the above discussion, the following result is the key for our classification.

**9.6 Proposition.** *Let $(M, o)$ be an $\mathfrak{g}$-homogeneous CR-germ and let $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ be the corresponding CR-algebra. Then $M$ is 5-dimensional, minimal and 2-nondegenerate if and only if*

$$\mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathfrak{g}_0) = 5 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{f} \neq \mathfrak{q}^{(2)} = \mathfrak{q}^{(\infty)} := \mathfrak{q} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{q}\ .$$

**9.7 Lemma.** *The Lie algebraic terms in* (9.6) *are equivalent to the following set of conditions:*

(I) $\dim \mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{g}_o = \dim \mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{F} = 2, \quad \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{H} = 1 = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{f}/\mathfrak{l}_o = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{f}$

(II) $[\mathfrak{g}_o, \mathfrak{F}] \subset \mathfrak{F}, \quad [\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{F}] \subset \mathfrak{F}, \quad [\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{H}$

(III) $[\mathfrak{q}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \not\subset \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ *$M$ is not Levi flat*

(IV) $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}, \quad \mathfrak{f} \neq \mathfrak{l}_o$ *$M$ is Levi degenerate*

(V) $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \not\subset \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ *$M$ is 2-nondegenerate.*

We will frequently use the fact that the condition '$[\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{F}$' (instead of $\subset \mathfrak{H}$) violates condition (V).

By the canonical bijection between the classes $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ mentioned in 9.2.iv and made precise above our classification problem is transferred to the classification of certain effective CR-algebras up to geometric equivalence. Unfortunately, to a given locally homogeneous CR-germ $(M, o)$ there may be associated many CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ for which the $\mathfrak{g}$'s are non-isomorphic. For instance, if $M = \mathcal{M}$ is the tube over the future light cone, then to $(\mathcal{M}, o)$ there are associated CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ with $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$, $\mathfrak{so}(1, 3)$, $\mathfrak{so}(2, 2)$ together with a bunch of other Lie algebras that are not semisimple, see [19] for explicit realizations. Therefore, the best we can do in the following is to consider only CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ such that $\dim \mathfrak{g}$ is minimal in the geometric equivalence class of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$. But, also then, we are still left in the example $(\mathcal{M}, o)$ with several non-isomorphic solvable Lie algebras of dimension 5 as well as one non-solvable Lie algebra of dimension 5 with 2-dimensional non-abelian radical and Levi part $\cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$.

**9.8 Fundamental Assumption.** In the following, every CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ under consideration is assumed to satisfy the condition (9.6) (equivalently (I) – (V)) as well as the following additional condition.

(VI) For every CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{q}')$, which is geometrically CR-equivalent to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$, the dimension estimate $\dim \mathfrak{g}' \geq \dim \mathfrak{g}$ holds.

Condition (VI) implies, in particular, the following two conditions.

(VI)$_1$ $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is effective.

(VI)$_2$ There is no proper subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathfrak{g}' + \mathfrak{g}_o = \mathfrak{g}$ for $\mathfrak{g}_o = \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{q}$.

Indeed, $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{q}')$ with $\mathfrak{q}' := (\mathfrak{g}' + i\mathfrak{g}') \cap \mathfrak{q}$ is a CR-algebra that is geometrically equivalent to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ in case $\mathfrak{g}' + \mathfrak{g}_o = \mathfrak{g}$.

**9.9 Basic structure theory.** In the following we frequently use standard facts concerning reductive Lie algebras and parabolic subalgebras, see [22], Chap.VI-VII, as a general reference. To fix our notation, let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a complex reductive Lie algebra and $\mathfrak{t}$ a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{s}$. Denote by $\Phi = \Phi(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ the corresponding root system and by $\Pi \subset \Phi$ the subset of simple roots. A subalgebra $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ is called *parabolic* if it contains a maximal solvable subalgebra (also called a *Borel subalgebra*) $\mathfrak{b}$ of $\mathfrak{s}$. Conjugacy classes of parabolic subalgebras in $\mathfrak{s}$ are parameterized by the subsets of $\Pi$: For every $\mathscr{P} \subset \Pi$ and $\langle\!\langle \mathscr{P} \rangle\!\rangle := \Phi \cap \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathscr{P}} \mathbb{Z}\alpha$ the corresponding parabolic subalgebra is defined by

$$\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}_{\mathscr{P}} := \mathfrak{r}^{\text{red}} \oplus \mathfrak{r}^{\text{nil}} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathfrak{r}^{\text{red}} := \mathfrak{t} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \langle\!\langle \mathscr{P} \rangle\!\rangle} \mathfrak{s}_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{r}^{\text{nil}} := \bigoplus_{\alpha \notin \langle\!\langle \mathscr{P} \rangle\!\rangle} \mathfrak{s}_\alpha \ . \tag{9.10}$$

The case of a reductive *real* Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}$ is a little bit more sophisticated. In contrast to the complex situation there may exist several conjugacy classes of Cartan subalgebras. Among these the class most suitable for our purposes consists of the so-called *maximally split Cartan subalgebras* $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{s}$, defined as follows: Select a Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ and let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a maximal abelian subalgebra of $\mathfrak{p}$. Consider the centralizer $\mathfrak{m} := C_{\mathfrak{k}}(\mathfrak{a})$ and put $\mathfrak{t} := \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{m}}$, where $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathfrak{m}} \subset \mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal abelian subalgebra. The conjugacy classes of real parabolic subalgebras in $\mathfrak{s}$ are parameterized by the subsets of the simple roots $\Pi \subset \Phi(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{a})$ in the restricted root system $\Phi(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{a}) \subset \mathfrak{a}^*$. Each parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{r}$ in $\mathfrak{s}$ has the decomposition $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}^{\text{red}} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\text{nil}}$ into the reductive and nilpotent parts (once a maximally split Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{r}$ is selected, the reductive factor with $\mathfrak{r}^{\text{red}} \supset \mathfrak{t}$ is unique). Following a common convention the roots $\lambda$ occurring in the root space decomposition of the nilpotent ideal $\mathfrak{r}^{\text{nil}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathfrak{s}_\lambda$ are negative and we write

$\mathfrak{r}^{-\,\mathrm{n}} := \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{nil}}$, $\mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{r}} := \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{red}}$ and $\Phi^{-\,\mathrm{n}} := \Phi(\mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{nil}}, \mathfrak{a}) = \Lambda$. Each parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{r}$ containing $\mathfrak{t}$ determines the decomposition

$$\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{n}} \oplus \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{r}} \oplus \mathfrak{r}^{-\,\mathrm{n}} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{n}} := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Phi(\mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{nil}}, \mathfrak{a})} \mathfrak{s}_{-\lambda}\,, \quad \text{and we put} \quad \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{opp}} := \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{r}} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}^{\mathrm{n}}\,. \tag{9.11}$$

We call $\mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{s}) := \dim \mathfrak{t}$ the *rank* of $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{s}) := \dim \mathfrak{a}$ with $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ as above the *real rank* of $\mathfrak{s}$.

## 10. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ has small semisimple part

In the preceding section we have explained how 2-nondegeneracy can be expressed in pure Lie algebraic terms. In this section we start with the actual proof of Theorem II. Since this proof will be quite involved, we subdivide it into several sections, lemmata and claims until the final step is completed in Section 16. For the convenience of the reader we briefly outline the main steps.

As explained above the classification can be reduced to the determination of all CR-algebras satisfying the fundamental assumption 9.8. Once all possible CR-algebras are known, we have to identify the underlying CR-germs. In general, it may happen that algebraically non-equivalent CR-algebras give rise to equivalent CR-germs. For this last part of the proof we use results from Section 8.

Our proceeding will be to show that the assumption 9.8 severely restricts the possibilities for $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$. This will be achieved by a detailed structural study of the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}$ occurring in $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$. Recall that every Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ has a Levi-Malčev decomposition $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{ss}} \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{h})$, where $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ is semisimple and is uniquely determined up to an inner automorphism of $\mathfrak{h}$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{h})$ is the radical of $\mathfrak{h}$, i.e., the unique maximal solvable ideal in $\mathfrak{h}$. In the first part of the proof we investigate the various possibilities for $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ where $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ satisfies certain conditions stated in the previous section. To be precise: *For the rest of the paper the fundamental assumption* 9.8 *remains in force for* all *CR-algebras* $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ *under consideration.* In particular, every $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is effective (condition (VI)$_1$, and therefore $\mathfrak{g}$ can be considered as a transitive Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{hol}(M, o)$). Furthermore, condition (VI)$_2$ states that there is no proper Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ that also is transitive on $(M, o)$.

Let an arbitrary CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ subject to 9.8 be given and let $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ be a Levi-Malčev decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$. In this and in the following few sections we assume that $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} \neq 0$ and investigate which simple factors can occur in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$. Thereby we use the following notation: We fix a simple ideal $\mathfrak{s}$ in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ and denote by $\mathfrak{s}'$ the corresponding complementary ideal, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}\,\mathfrak{g} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} = \mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{s}'\,. \tag{10.1}$$

In this section we show that $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ only can contain simple factors isomorphic to one of the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{so}(2,3)$, $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$, $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. This result is obtained by analyzing which simple real Lie algebras can contain proper subalgebras of very low codimensions. In the next sections we exclude further possibilities for $\mathfrak{s}$: In Section 11 we show that the factors $\mathfrak{so}(2,3)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$ cannot occur in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ as it will turn out that their existence in the Levi factor would violate the minimality assumption (VI). Nevertheless notice that there exist CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{so}(2,3), \mathfrak{q})$ and $(\mathfrak{so}(1,3), \mathfrak{q})$ satisfying (I) – (V) and (VI)$_1$. All the underlying CR-germs of such CR-algebras are locally CR-equivalent to the light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$. In Section 12 we find first examples of CR-algebras which satisfy 9.8. In these cases $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ contains a simple factor $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, and then necessarily $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{r}$, where $\mathfrak{r}$ is a 2-dimensional non-abelian Lie algebra. Also all such CR-algebras give rise only to CR-germ locally CR-equivalent to the tube over the light cone. In Section 13 we finally eliminate the possibility $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ for the simple factor $\mathfrak{s}$ in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$. At that stage of the proof we will have proved the following dichotomy: Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ be an arbitrary CR-algebra which obeys 9.8. If $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} \neq 0$ then $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ and furthermore the underlying CR-germ is locally CR-equivalent to the light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$. Or, $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} = 0$, i.e., $\mathfrak{g}$ is solvable.

For that reason, from Section 14 on we only consider CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ with $\mathfrak{g}$ solvable and show that then necessarily $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 5 = \dim M$. In Section 15 we look closer at the nilcenter $\mathfrak{z}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ and find out that $\dim\mathfrak{z} \in \{1,3\}$. The Main Lemma 15.14, which might be of interest for itself, gives a sufficient condition for a CR-algebra to be associated to a tube $F + i\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ over an affinely homogeneous surface $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. In the last section we show by ad-hoc methods that indeed every 5-dimensional solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ occurring in the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ under consideration fulfills the assumption of the Main Lemma. Hence, due to the aforementioned assertions and since (up to local affine equivalence) all affinely homogeneous surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$ occur among the examples 8.1 – 8.5, this completes the proof of the classification theorem.

We now begin with the proof of Theorem II:

**10.2 Lemma.** *Let* $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ *be a CR-algebra subject to* (9.8). *Then the simple Lie subalgebra* $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ *can only be isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{so}(2,3)$ , $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$ , $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ *or* $\mathfrak{su}(2)$.

*Proof.* The proof is carried out in several reduction steps. To begin with, we write as shorthand

$$\mathfrak{h}_o := \mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{h}\,, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{F}} := \mathfrak{F} \cap \mathfrak{h} \ \text{ and } \ \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{H}} := \mathfrak{H} \cap \mathfrak{h}$$

for every subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Notice that $\mathfrak{h}_o \subset \mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ are subalgebras and $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ is a linear $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{F}})$–stable subspace of $\mathfrak{h}$.

Consider the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ of $\mathfrak{s}$. The case $\mathfrak{s}_o = \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{s}$, that is $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}_o$, can be ruled out since then $\mathfrak{s}' \oplus \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ would be a proper locally transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, contradicting assumption $(\mathsf{VI})_2$. Therefore, at least one of the inclusions $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ is proper. Consequently, there is always a proper subalgebra of codimension $\leq 3$ in $\mathfrak{s}$. Indeed, in case $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} \neq \mathfrak{s}$ the subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ has this property and in case $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{s}$ the proper subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_o$ has codimension $\leq 2$. Hence, there exists a maximal proper subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ of $\mathfrak{s}$ with either $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ or $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{h}$. Such a maximal subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ has codimension $\leq 3$ in $\mathfrak{s}$. Due to [9], Chap. VIII, §10, Cor. 1, every maximal proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{s}$ is either reductive or parabolic. In the following claims we list all simple Lie algebras $\mathfrak{s}$ which admit proper maximal subalgebras of such low codimensions. We discuss the reductive and parabolic case separately.

**Claim 1:** *Let* $\mathfrak{k}$ *be a simple real algebra and* $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{k}$ *reductive with* $0 < \mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{s}}\,\mathfrak{h} \leq 3$. *Then* $\mathfrak{k}$ *can only be isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ *or* $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$.

*Proof of the claim.* Let $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{h}_p \times \mathfrak{z}$ be the decomposition of the reductive subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ into the simple factors $\mathfrak{h}_j$ and the center $\mathfrak{z}$. Weyl's Theorem implies the existence of an $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h})$-stable complement $\mathfrak{v} \subset \mathfrak{s}$. Let $\varrho : \mathfrak{h} \to \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{v})$ be the induced adjoint representation. Every restriction $\varrho_j : \mathfrak{h}_j \to \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{v})$ must be faithful since otherwise $\mathfrak{h}_j$ would be an ideal in $\mathfrak{s}$. The crucial condition here is $\dim\mathfrak{v} \leq 3$ which, in turn, implies that each $\mathfrak{h}_j$ is isomorphic either to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ or $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{R})$. As a consequence

$$\dim\mathfrak{h} \leq \begin{cases} 8k & r = 2k \\ 8k+3 & r = 2k+1 \end{cases} \qquad \text{for} \quad r := \mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{h}) \leq \mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{s})\,.$$

On the other hand, a glance at the classification of simple Lie algebras shows

$$\dim\mathfrak{s} \geq \begin{cases} 2k^2 + 4k = \dim_{\mathbb{R}}\mathfrak{sl}(k+1,\mathbb{C}) & r = 2k \\ 4k^2 + 8k + 3 = \dim\mathfrak{sl}(2k+2,\mathbb{R}) & r = 2k+1\,. \end{cases}$$

Putting both inequalities together and bearing in mind $\dim\mathfrak{s} - \dim\mathfrak{h} \leq 3$ shows that the rank of $\mathfrak{s}$ can only be one of the numbers $1, 2, 4$. Since $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ are the only simple real Lie algebras of rank 1 we may assume that $\mathfrak{s}$ has rank 2 or 4. The case $\mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{s}) = 4$ can be ruled out in the following way: Consider first the situation where $\mathfrak{s}$ is *of complex type,* that is, $\mathfrak{s}$ is the underlying real Lie algebra of a complex simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{c}$ of (complex) rank 2. Then $\mathfrak{c}$ is either $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{so}(5,\mathbb{C})$. But in both cases a proper reductive real subalgebra has at least (real) codimension 4 (in fact, 8). If $\mathfrak{s}$ is *of real type* then the above estimates give $\dim\mathfrak{h} \leq 16$ and $\dim\mathfrak{s} \geq 24 = \dim\mathfrak{sl}(5,\mathbb{R})$. For the remaining case $\mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{s}) = 2$ either $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(1,3)$, which is in the list of the claim, or $\mathfrak{s}$ is isomorphic to a real form of $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{so}(5,\mathbb{C})$. In both cases every proper reductive complex subalgebra has at least codimension 4. This proves Claim 1. □

**Claim 2:** *Let* $\mathfrak{k}$ *is a simple real Lie algebra and* $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{k}$ *parabolic with* $0 < \mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{s}}\,\mathfrak{h} \leq 3$. *Then* $\mathfrak{s}$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$*,* $\mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{R})$*,* $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ *or to a non-compact real form of* $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ *or* $\mathfrak{so}(5,\mathbb{C})$.

*Proof of the claim.* Since every parabolic subalgebra of a compact Lie algebra is trivial, apart from $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ we only have to consider the case where $\mathfrak{s}$ is non-compact. The estimate $\mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{s}) \leq \dim \mathfrak{s} - \dim \mathfrak{h}$, compare (9.9), implies $\mathrm{rk}(\mathfrak{s}) \leq 3$. We work out the various cases separately.

**rk $\mathfrak{s}$ = 3 :** The complexification $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathfrak{s}$ is one of the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{C})$, $\mathfrak{so}(7,\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(3,\mathbb{C})$. The latter two can be immediately ruled out since a glance at the corresponding Satake diagrams shows that every proper parabolic subalgebra of them is at least of codimension 4. In the remaining case $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{C})$ only the normal real form $\mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{R})$ has a parabolic subalgebra of codimension 3. (A glance at the Satake diagrams for the remaining non-compact real forms of $\mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{C})$ excludes further possibilities).

**rk $\mathfrak{s}$ = 2 or 1:** The rank conditions imply that $\mathfrak{s}$ is the underlying real Lie algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ or a real form of $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{so}(5,\mathbb{C})$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(1,3)$ as well as every non-compact real form of $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{so}(5,\mathbb{C})$ contains a parabolic subalgebra of codimension less or equal 3. Since $\dim \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) = \dim \mathfrak{su}(2) = 3$, all simple Lie algebras of rank one also contain parabolic subalgebras of the required codimension.

In order to further reduce the list of possibilities for $\mathfrak{s}$ we have to look at the particular real forms obtained in Claim 1 and 2 but not in the list of Lemma 10.2 more closely:

**Elimination of $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{R})$:** Up to an automorphism of $\mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{R})$ there is only one such parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ of codimension 3. Let $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ be the split Cartan subalgebra and $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}}$ the decomposition as in (9.11). Note that here the reductive factor $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}} \cong \mathfrak{gl}(3,\mathbb{R})$ acts irreducibly on $\mathfrak{h}^{\pm\mathrm{n}} \cong \mathbb{R}^3$. The only possibility for the flag $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{s}$, which cannot be trivially excluded, is when $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{h} \subsetneq \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}} \subsetneq \mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{s}_o) \leq 2$. This cannot be true since $\dim {}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}}\!/_{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}} = 2$, $[\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} : \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}] \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ (condition (II)) but $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ acts irreducibly on the 3-dimensional space ${}^{\mathfrak{s}}\!/_{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}} \cong \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{n}}$.

**Elimination of $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(1,2)$ :** In this case of real rank 1, there exists up to conjugacy only one parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$: This is the minimal one $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_{\varnothing} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$ which is solvable with $\mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{s}}\, \mathfrak{h} = 3$. The reductive part $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{a} =: \mathfrak{t}$ of $\mathfrak{h}$ is a maximally split Cartan subalgebra. As before, the only situation which cannot be trivially disposed of is when $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{h}$ and $c := \mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{s}_o) \in \{0,1,2\}$. Recall that $\mathfrak{h}$ yields the decomposition $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{n}} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}}$. If $c = 0$, that is $\mathfrak{s}_o = \mathfrak{h}$, then $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{n}} \oplus \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ would be a proper locally transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ in contradiction to assumption (VI)$_2$. If $c = 1$ then either $\mathfrak{t} \cap \mathfrak{s}_o \neq \mathfrak{t}$, and then $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{opp}} \oplus \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ would be a proper locally transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ (again contradicting (VI)$_2$) or $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{s}_o$. But taking into account the particular structure of $\mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}} = \mathfrak{s}_{-\lambda} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-2\lambda}$ this also does not occur since otherwise $\mathfrak{s}_o \cap \mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}}$ would be a $\mathfrak{t}$-stable 2-dimensional subalgebra, which is impossible since $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{t})$ acts irreducibly on the 2-dimensional root spaces $\mathfrak{s}_{\pm\lambda}$ and $[\mathfrak{s}_\lambda, \mathfrak{s}_\lambda] = \mathfrak{s}_{2\lambda}$.
It remains the case $c = 2$, that is, $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{su}(1,2)$ is locally transitive. Then $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ is a subalgebra of complex dimension 5. Consequently $\mathfrak{q}$ is contained in a maximal (6-dimensional) parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathfrak{gl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes \mathbb{C}^2$ of $\mathfrak{l}$, that is, either $\mathfrak{q}$ coincides with a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ or is conjugate to a subalgebra $\mathfrak{j} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes \mathbb{C}^2$. In both cases the subgroups $Q$ of $L = \mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{C})$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{b}$ or $\mathfrak{j}$ are closed and the underlying CR-germ $(M,o)$ is locally CR-equivalent to an $\mathrm{SU}(1,2)$-orbit either in $L/B \cong \mathbb{F}(\mathbb{C}^3)$, the complex manifold of full flags in $\mathbb{C}^3$, or in the $\mathbb{C}^*$-principal bundle $L/J$ over $\mathbb{P}_2(\mathbb{C})$. A direct check shows that in both cases there do not exist 2-nondegenerate $\mathrm{SU}(1,2)$-orbits.

**Elimination of $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{R})$.** Then $3 \leq \dim \mathfrak{s}_o \leq 6$ holds except for the trivial case $\mathfrak{s}_o = \mathfrak{s}$. If $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o = 3$ and hence $\mathfrak{s}$ is locally transitive, then as in the previous situation each CR-germ $(M,o)$ associated with a CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{R}),\mathfrak{q})$ is locally CR-equivalent to an $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$-orbit either in $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{C})/B$ or $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{C})/J$ (as discussed above, with $\mathrm{SL}(3,\mathbb{R})$ in place of $\mathrm{SU}(1,2)$). Again, none of these orbits is 2-nondegenerate. It remains the case $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o \geq 4$. But then there always exists a parabolic (proper) subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ with $\mathfrak{s}_o + \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{s}$, that is, $\mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a proper locally transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ excluding the case $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$.

**Elimination of $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(1,4)$.** There exists up to conjugacy a unique parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ of codimension 3, and we have to investigate the cases $\mathfrak{s} \supsetneq \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}} \supsetneq \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{h} \supset \mathfrak{s}_o$ only. A close look at the minimal (and maximal proper) parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_\lambda$ shows that $\mathfrak{m} \cong \mathfrak{so}(3)$ and $\mathfrak{m}$ acts irreducibly on the 3-dimensional nilpotent ideal $\mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}} = \mathfrak{s}_{-\lambda}$. Consequently $\mathfrak{h}$ acts irreducibly on $\mathfrak{s}/\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{s}/\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} \cong \mathbb{R}^3$. This leads to a contradiction as $[\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}] \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}$, i.e., ${}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}}\!/_{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}}$ would be a 2-dimensional stable subspace. The proof of Lemma 10.2 is now complete. □

In Theorem 6 of [3] it is claimed that for every 2-nondegenerate real-analytic hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{hol}(M, a)$ has dimension $\leq 11$ at every point. Using this result would save few arguments in the proof of Lemma 10.2. Instead, we preferred to present a self-contained proof of the proposition.

## 11. The cases $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$ and $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(1, 3)$

We continue the proof of Theorem II. So far we have proved that for the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ under consideration the simple factor ss of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$, see (10.1), can only be isomorphic to one of the simple Lie algebras listed in Lemma 10.2. In this section we show that from these the possibilities $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$ and $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(1, 3)$ cannot occur. Here and in the following upper case roman numerals refer to the conditions around 9.8.

We like to mention that for the tube $\mathcal{M}$ over the future light cone $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, o) \cong \mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$ holds and that there exists a copy of $\mathfrak{so}(1, 3)$ in $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, a)$ that is also locally transitive. Since these Lie algebras have dimensions 10 and 6 and since, on the other hand, there are transitive subalgebras of $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, o)$ of dimension 5 these two Lie algebras do not satisfy the minimality condition (VI). In the following we consider both cases separately:

**$\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$.** The only Lie subalgebras $\mathfrak{h}$ in the normal real form $\mathfrak{so}(2, 3)$ with $\mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{s}}\, \mathfrak{h} \leq 3$ are the 3-codimensional maximal parabolic subalgebras. We need to take a closer look at the structure of these subalgebras. There are up to isomorphisms of $\mathfrak{s}$ only two such parabolic subalgebras: If $\Pi(\mathfrak{a}) = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ is a basis of the root system $\Phi(\mathfrak{a})$ ($\mathfrak{a}$ split Cartan subalgebra, $\alpha$ long, $\beta$ short) then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_1 &:= (\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha}) \quad \oplus \quad \mathfrak{s}_{-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha-2\beta} = \mathfrak{h}_1^{\mathrm{r}} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_1^{-\mathrm{n}} \\ \mathfrak{h}_2 &:= (\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\beta}) \quad \oplus \quad \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha-2\beta} = \mathfrak{h}_2^{\mathrm{r}} \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_2^{-\mathrm{n}} \end{aligned}$$

are representatives of the corresponding isomorphy classes. The only instance where the filtration $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ could be nontrivial (recall that $\mathfrak{s}_o,\ \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ are subalgebras, $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ is a $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}})$-stable subspace) arises when $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{h}_j \subset \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ for $j = 1, 2$. The possibility '$\mathfrak{h}_2 = \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}$' cannot occur since the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{h}_2^{\mathrm{r}}$ on $\mathfrak{h}_2^{\mathrm{n}} \cong \mathfrak{s}/\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ is irreducible, contradicting the existence of a 2-dimensional $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}})$–stable subspace ${}^{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{H}}}/_{\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}}}$. It remains the possibility $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{h}_1 \supset \mathfrak{s}_o$. From now on $\mathfrak{h} := \mathfrak{h}_1$ and we analyze the various possibilities for $\dim \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} - \dim \mathfrak{s}_o \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. The equation $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{s}_o$ contradicts condition $(\mathsf{VI})_2$ since in that case the proper subalgebra $(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{n}} \oplus \mathfrak{s}') \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ would be transitive on $(M, o)$. The case when $\mathfrak{s}_o$ is of codimension 1 in $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{h}$ can also be ruled out: Either $\mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}} \subset \mathfrak{s}_o$ and then $(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{opp}} \oplus \mathfrak{s}') \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ would be a transitive proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, or the intersection of $\mathfrak{s}_o$ with $\mathfrak{h}^{-\mathrm{n}} = (\mathfrak{s}_{-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\beta-\alpha}) \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\alpha-2\beta}$ is a 2-dimensional subalgebra. In such a case the image $\pi(\mathfrak{s}_o)$ of the projection $\pi : \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{-n} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}} \to \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}}$ coincides with $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}}$. But this also leads to a contradiction: Neither the intersection $\mathfrak{s}_o \cap \mathfrak{h}^{-n}$ can coincide with $\mathfrak{s}_{-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\beta-\alpha}$ (since it is not a subalgebra), nor $(\mathfrak{s}_{-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\beta-\alpha}) \cap \mathfrak{s}_o$ can be 1-dimensional (since $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{r}}$ acts irreducibly on $(\mathfrak{s}_{-\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{s}_{-\beta-\alpha})$). Finally we are left with the case $\dim \mathfrak{s}_{\mathfrak{F}} - \dim \mathfrak{s}_o = 2$, i.e., $\mathfrak{s}$ is transitive on $(M, o)$. Thus $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}$ by assumption $(\mathsf{VI})$. But then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_o = 5$ and there always exist proper subalgebras $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$ with $\mathfrak{g}' + \mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}$, a contradiction to condition $(\mathsf{VI})_2$.

**$\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{so}(1, 3) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$.** We work out this case by investigating various possibilities for $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o$. Assume first that

- $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o \geq 3$. We claim that then there exists a solvable subalgebra $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ such that $\mathfrak{s}_o + \mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{s}$ : The case $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o \geq 4$ is easily settled as all 4-dimensional subalgebras in $\mathfrak{s}$ are maximal, i.e., they are Borel subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and consequently have nilpotent complementary subalgebras. There do not exist (real) subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ of dimension 5. If $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o = 3$ then $\mathfrak{s}$ is either semisimple or solvable. In the semisimple case we work with an explicit matrix realization $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$: Either $\mathfrak{s}_o \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ or $\cong \mathfrak{su}(1, 1)$, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{s}_o \cong \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} it & \varepsilon\overline{z} \\ z & -it \end{pmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R}, z \in \mathbb{C} \right\} \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon = 1 \ \text{ or } \ \varepsilon = -1\ .$$

In both cases the upper triangular Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}^+ \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$ forms a linear complement of $\mathfrak{s}_o$. This cannot happen, since then condition $(\mathsf{VI})_2$ would be violated.

If $\mathfrak{s}_o$ is solvable then $\mathfrak{s}_o$ is contained as certain 1-codimensional (real) subalgebra in a (complex) Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{t} \ltimes \mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}}$ of $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. We claim that $\mathfrak{s}_o \supset \mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}}$ : Otherwise (i.e., if $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{s}_o \cap \mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}} = 1$) we would have $\pi(\mathfrak{s}_o) = \mathfrak{t}$, where $\pi : \mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{t}$ is the projection homomorphism, and consequently $\mathfrak{s}_o$ would contain a certain complex Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}'$ of $\mathfrak{b}$ which acts $\mathbb{R}$-irreducibly on $\mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}}$.
However, from our claim it follows that the opposite Borel subalgebra is a complementary subspace of $\mathfrak{s}_o$ in $\mathfrak{s}$. The case '$\dim \mathfrak{s}_o = 3$' now is completely ruled out. Next, we investigate the case
- $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o = 2$. It follows that $\mathfrak{s}_o$ is solvable and either complex or totally real. Since it is immediate that every complex subalgebra in $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ has a complementary subalgebra (simple check), it remains only to deal with the totally real case, i.e., with $\mathfrak{s}_o$ being a real form of a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Let $\tau : \mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{b}$ be the conjugation with $\mathfrak{b}^\tau = \mathfrak{s}_o$. It is well-known that there exists a $\tau$-stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ and consequently we have the $\tau$-stable decomposition $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{t} \ltimes [\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b}] =: \mathfrak{t} \ltimes \mathfrak{n}$. Select $\mathsf{h} \in \mathfrak{t}$, $\mathsf{e} \in \mathfrak{n}$ such that $[\mathsf{h}, \mathsf{e}] = 2\mathsf{e}$. By construction $\tau(\mathsf{h}) = a{\cdot}\mathsf{h}$ and $\tau(\mathsf{e}) = b{\cdot}\mathsf{e}$ for suitable $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\tau$ is an automorphism, $a = 1$. Since $\tau$ is an involution, $|b| = 1$. This shows that up to a conjugation we may assume that $\mathfrak{b}$ is the upper-triangular Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and the real forms $\mathfrak{s}_o \subset \mathfrak{b}^+$ have the following realizations:

$$\mathfrak{s}_o \cong \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} t & sc \\ 0 & -t \end{pmatrix} : t, s \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \text{ for some } c \in \mathbb{C}^* \,.$$

For every $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ at least one of the Borel subalgebras $\mathbb{C}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \oplus \mathbb{C}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ or $\mathbb{C}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \oplus \mathbb{C}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & -1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ then is complementary to $\mathfrak{s}_o$ in $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Finally, we need to deal with the case
- $\dim \mathfrak{s}_o = 1$, i.e., $\mathfrak{s}$ itself is locally transitive and thus $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}$ by the minimality condition $(\mathsf{VI})_2$. Consider the following matrix realization:

$$\begin{gathered} \mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \;\subset\; \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2} \times \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2} \\ \sigma(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) = (\bar{\mathsf{y}}, \bar{\mathsf{x}})\,, \qquad \mathfrak{g} = \{(\mathsf{x}, \bar{\mathsf{x}}) : \mathsf{x} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})\} \subset \mathfrak{l}\,. \end{gathered}$$

The 3-dimensional complex subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ is either simple or solvable:
$\mathfrak{q}$ *simple:* Then $\mathfrak{q} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ is either one of the two factors of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ or $\mathfrak{q}$ is conjugate in $\mathfrak{l}$ to $\mathfrak{g}$. The first case can be ruled out immediately since then $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{g} = 0 = \mathfrak{g}_o$ which is absurd. In the second case, all simple subalgebras $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ which are not ideals are conjugate to each other. We may select the particular subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} = \{(\mathsf{x}, -\mathsf{x}^t) : \mathsf{x} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})\} \subset \mathfrak{l}$, where $\mathsf{x}^t$ is the transpose of $\mathsf{x}$. The corresponding Lie subgroup $Q = \{(\mathsf{q}, (\mathsf{q}^{-1})^t) : \mathsf{q} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})\} \subset L := \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is closed and the map $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) \mapsto \mathsf{x}{\cdot}\mathsf{y}^t$ identifies the quotient with the affine quadric $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$ on which $S := \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ (considered as real Lie group) acts by the holomorphic transformations $(\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{z}) \mapsto \mathsf{s}\mathsf{z}\bar{\mathsf{s}}^t$. Hence, in this situation every CR-germ associated with a CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{q})$ is globalizable. It is well-known (see, for instance [19]) that the hypersurface $S$-orbits in $L/Q$ are either Levi-nondegenerate or locally CR-equivalent to the tube $\mathcal{M}$ over the light cone. However, $\dim \mathfrak{g} = 6$ and in this case $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ satisfies $(\mathsf{I})$ – $(\mathsf{V})$, $(\mathsf{VI})_1$ and $(\mathsf{VI})_2$, but not $(\mathsf{VI})$.
$\mathfrak{q}$ *solvable:* We will show that also this case contradicts the fundamental assumption 9.8:
If $\mathfrak{l}_o = \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{t}, \bar{\mathsf{t}})$ is ad-semisimple (and without loss of generality $\mathsf{t} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} t & \\ & -t \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ for some $t \in \mathbb{C}^*$) then $\mathfrak{l}_o$ is a regular torus in $\mathfrak{l}$. Consequently, the centralizer $C_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathfrak{l}_o) =: \mathfrak{t}_1 \times \mathfrak{t}_2$ is a $\sigma$-stable Cartan subalgebra. Either $C_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathfrak{l}_o) \subset \mathfrak{q}$ (but then $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ is of codimension 2 in $\mathfrak{l}$) or $C_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathfrak{l}_o) \cap \mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l}_o$. In the latter case denote by $\mathfrak{l}^{\pm\alpha_1}$, $\mathfrak{l}^{\pm\alpha_2}$ the root spaces with respect to $\mathfrak{t}_1 \times \mathfrak{t}_2$. A direct check shows that $\mathfrak{q}$ is the direct sum of $\mathfrak{l}_o$ with two further root spaces (also if $\bar{\mathsf{t}} = \mathsf{t}$). Since $\mathfrak{q}$ is solvable, there are 4 possibilities of choosing such pairs of root spaces. In all 4 cases either $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ is too small or $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{l}_o$, i.e., the corresponding CR-germ is Levi nondegenerate.
It remains to discuss the case when $\mathfrak{l}_o = \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{n}, \bar{\mathsf{n}})$ is ad-nilpotent. Since $\mathfrak{q}$ is solvable, it is contained in a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b}$ of $\mathfrak{l}$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}} = C_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathfrak{l}_o) \cong \mathbb{C}\mathsf{n} \times \mathbb{C}\bar{\mathsf{n}}$. Let $\pi : \mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{b}/\mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}}$ be the canonical projection. The image $\pi(\mathfrak{q})$ cannot be surjective since there is no 3-dimensional subalgebra $\mathbb{C}(\mathsf{n}, \bar{\mathsf{n}}) \subset \mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ with this property. It remains only the possibility $\mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ but then $\mathfrak{q} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{b}^{\text{nil}}$, which is too big.

Summarizing, we have for the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ satisfying 9.8 that $\mathfrak{g}^{\text{ss}}$ must be a finite direct sum of copies of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. In the next section we direct our attention to factors of type $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$.

## 12. The case $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$

In this section we continue the proof of Theorem II and consider only CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ subject to 9.8, for which the simple factor $\mathfrak{s}$ of $\mathfrak{g}^{ss}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, compare (10.1). As already proved, the remaining simple factors in $\mathfrak{s}'$ (if there are any) are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ or $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$.

From $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, o) \cong \mathfrak{so}(2,3)$ for the light cone tube $\mathcal{M}$ it is clear that $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, o)$ contains copies of $\mathfrak{so}(2,2) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. Fixing a subalgebra $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ (which is necessarily non-abelian) the 5-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{r}$ can be embedded into $\mathfrak{hol}(\mathcal{M}, o)$, and this can be done in such a way that the image is a transitive subalgebra. Therefore, the simple factor $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ of $\mathfrak{g}^{ss}$ cannot avoided in the classification proof. However, we will show that this factor only occurs in the instance described above, that is, in connection with $\mathcal{M}$.

Our first result is that in $\mathfrak{g}^{ss}$ the simple factor $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ can occur at most once. Here and in the following we repeatedly use the basic fact that each proper subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ has a solvable complementary subalgebra. Furthermore, through this subsection we denote by $\pi : \mathfrak{g} = (\mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{s}') \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathfrak{s}$ the canonical projection. We analyze various possibilities for the image of the isotropy subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_o$ under $\pi$.
If $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o) \neq 0$ then there exists a solvable complement $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ to $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ and $(\mathfrak{r} \times \mathfrak{s}') \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a proper transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ violating $(\mathsf{VI})_2$.
If $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o) = 0$ then $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}' \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ and is there of codimension 2. It follows that there is no factor $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ in $\mathfrak{s}'$: Otherwise, counting dimensions we would have $\dim \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{s}_o \geq 1$ which implies that there is a proper transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, violating $(\mathsf{VI})_2$. This proves that $\mathfrak{s}'$ is a product of factors which all are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Finally, we show that $\mathfrak{s}'$ consists of at most *one* such simple factor: Indeed, suppose that $\mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{s}''$ for some ideal $\mathfrak{h} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ of $\mathfrak{s}'$. Denote by $\pi_{\mathfrak{h}} := (\mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{s}'') \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathfrak{h}$ the canonical projection. Then $\pi_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ has codimension $\leq 2$ in $\mathfrak{h}$. Since $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ does not have a subalgebra of dimension 2, the dimension of $\pi_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ can only be 1 or 3. But dimension 3 violates $(\mathsf{VI})_2$ since then $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_o + \ker(\pi_{\mathfrak{h}})$. It remains the case $\dim \pi_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{g}_o) = 1$. Then $\pi_{\mathfrak{h}}(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ is a torus in $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o) = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}_o$. Since $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{h}$ is a transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ we must have $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}$ by $(\mathsf{VI})_2$. But this is not possible:

**12.1 Lemma.** $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ *implies* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ *and* $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$.

*Proof.* By the above discussion we only have to rule out the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{s}'$ with $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{s}' = \mathfrak{su}(2)$. The key point here is that the isotropy subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_o$ is toral in $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and that there exists a unique $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g}_o)$–stable subspace $\mathfrak{p}^\star \subset \mathfrak{su}(2)$ on which the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}_o$ is irreducible. Let $\pi_{\mathfrak{su}} : \mathfrak{s} \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2) \to \mathfrak{su}(2)$ be the projection onto the second factor. Either $\pi_{\mathfrak{su}}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{su}(2)$ or $\pi_{\mathfrak{su}}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{g}_o$. In the first case, we actually have $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{su}(2)$ as $[\mathfrak{g}_o, \mathfrak{F}] \subset \mathfrak{F}$ and $[\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{g}_o] = 0$. But this cannot be true: Independently of what exactly $\mathfrak{H} = W \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)$ would be, we always would have $[\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{F}] \subset \mathfrak{F}$. But this violates the nondegeneracy condition $(\mathsf{V})$.
It remains the case $\pi_{\mathfrak{su}}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{g}_o$, i.e., $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_o$, where $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{F} \cap \mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{s}$ is a 2-dimensional real subalgebra. By a dimension argument $\dim \mathfrak{H} \cap \mathfrak{su}(2) \geq 2$. But this intersection must be $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g}_o)$-stable, which implies $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)$, i.e., $\mathfrak{H}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)$. Clearly, this violates condition $(\mathsf{III})$. □

In the next Lemma we show that the semidirect product $\mathfrak{s} \ltimes \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ in 12.1 actually is a direct product $\mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ and that the radical has dimension 2, i.e. $\mathfrak{g}$ has dimension 5. Recall the obvious fact that, up to isomorphy, there exist precisely two Lie algebras of dimension 2, the abelian Lie algebra $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and a non-abelian one.

**12.2 Lemma.** $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ *implies* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{r}$ *with* $\mathfrak{r} := \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ *being non-abelian and of dimension 2.*

*Proof.* Let $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{s}$ be the canonical projection. We use the same symbol also for the complex extension $\mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Because of $(\mathsf{I})$ and $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{r}$ the image $\pi(\mathfrak{F})$ has dimension $\leq 2$.

- $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{F}) = 0$ implies $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{r}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{F}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$. But this violates $(\mathsf{V})$.

- $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{F}) = 1$ implies $\pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{f})$ and $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{f}) = 1$. Consequently $\pi(\mathfrak{q}), \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ are 2-dimensional (Borel) subalgebras which generate $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ as a linear space (otherwise $(M, o)$ would be Levi flat). It follows $\pi^{-1}(\pi(\sigma\mathfrak{q})) \cap \mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f}$. But this implies $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$, a contradiction to $(\mathsf{V})$.

- $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{F}) = 2$. Note that $\pi(\mathfrak{f})$, $\pi(\sigma\mathfrak{f})$ are 1-dimensional since $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since $\pi(\mathfrak{f}) + \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{f})$ is a 2-dimensional subalgebra, $\mathfrak{t} := \pi(\mathfrak{f})$, $\mathfrak{t}' := \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{f}) = \sigma\mathfrak{t}$ are tori as follows with the elementary structure theory of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. The case '$\pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\mathfrak{q})$' can be excluded since otherwise we would have $\pi(\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \pi(\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f})$ which is a subalgebra, a contradiction to $(\mathsf{III})$. Hence, the only possibility remaining is $\pi(\mathfrak{f}) \neq \pi(\mathfrak{q})$. This implies $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{rad} = \sigma\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{rad} = \mathfrak{l}_o$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{l}_o$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{q}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}$, and, since $[\mathfrak{q}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] = \mathfrak{l}$, even an ideal of $\mathfrak{l}$. By the effectivity assumption $(\mathsf{VI})_1$, this implies $\mathfrak{g}_o = 0$, i.e., $\mathfrak{g}$ has dimension 5 and thus

$$\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes_{\varrho} \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{r} \ \text{ with } \ \dim \mathfrak{r} = 2\,, \tag{12.3}$$

where $\varrho : \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is the canonical inclusion.

**12.4 Claim.** *The first case in* (12.3)*, that is* $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes_{\varrho} \mathbb{R}^2$*, cannot occur.*
*Proof of the claim.* Let $\pi : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ be the canonical projection and $\sigma : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{l}$ the complex conjugation defining the real form $\mathfrak{g}$ of $\mathfrak{l}$. The possibility

- $\pi(\mathfrak{q}) = 0 \ (= \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{q}))$ can be excluded since then $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l}) = \sigma\mathfrak{q}$, violating $(\mathsf{III})$. Also

- $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{q}) = 1$ can be ruled out: Then $\pi(\mathfrak{q}) \neq \pi(\mathfrak{f})$ since otherwise $\pi(\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \pi(\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f})$ would be a subalgebra, violating $(\mathsf{III})$. Hence, $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l})$. But this contradicts $(\mathsf{V})$ since then $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l}) = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f}$.

- $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{q}) = 2$ (i.e., $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l}) = 0$) is the most involved case. Then $\pi(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{b}$ is a Borel subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. To rule out also this case we need some preparations. First realize $\mathfrak{l}$ as

$$\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \ltimes_{\varrho} \mathbb{C}^2 = \{(X,w) : X \in \mathfrak{sl}(\mathbb{C}^2),\ w \in \mathbb{C}^2\} \ \text{ with } \ [(X,w),(Y,u)] = ([X,Y]\ ,\ Xu - Yw)$$

and complex conjugation $\sigma$ given by $(X,w) \mapsto (\overline{X}, \overline{w})$. Since $(M,o)$ is not Levi flat (compare $(\mathsf{III})$), we necessarily have $\mathfrak{b} + \sigma\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$, and the 1-dimensional intersection $\mathfrak{b} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{b}$ is a toral subalgebra $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ (we use here the well-known fact that the [$\sigma$–stable] intersection of any two Borel subalgebras contains a [$\sigma$–stable] Cartan subalgebra). In the next two paragraphs we recall some elementary facts from the representation theory of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ which we need to complete our proof.

**12.5 $\sigma$-adapted $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triples.** Let $\mathsf{h} \in \mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ be the element for which $[\mathsf{h}, E] = 2E$ and $[\mathsf{h}, F] = -2F$ for every $E \in \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{nil}}$, $F \in \sigma(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{nil}}) = (\sigma\mathfrak{b})^{\mathrm{nil}}$. Since $\sigma$ interchanges the eigenspaces of $\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{h})$, we have $\sigma(\mathsf{h}) = -\mathsf{h}$. There are crucial technical points here: We claim that there exists $\mathsf{e} \in \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ such that $[\mathsf{e}, \sigma(\mathsf{e})] = \mathsf{h}$, i.e., $(\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}, \mathsf{f})$ with $\mathsf{f} := \sigma(\mathsf{e})$ being an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple in $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ (i.e., $[\mathsf{h},\mathsf{e}] = 2\mathsf{e},\ [\mathsf{h},\mathsf{f}] = -2\mathsf{f},\ [\mathsf{e},\mathsf{f}] = \mathsf{h}$).
**Construction:** We have to be careful here about signs: Since $\sigma$ defines a *non-compact* real form of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$, the nondegenerate Hermitian 2-form $\kappa(\cdot\,, \sigma(\,\cdot\,))$ has precisely one negative eigenvalue, where $\kappa$ denotes the Killing form. Since $\kappa(\mathsf{h}, \sigma(\mathsf{h})) = \kappa(\mathsf{h}, -\mathsf{h}) < 0$, it follows $\kappa(E, \sigma(E)) > 0$ and consequently $[\lambda E, \sigma(\lambda E)] = \mathsf{h}$ for an appropriately chosen $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ (keeping in mind the general formula $[E,F] = \kappa(E,F)H$ where $H$, the coroot, is a positive multiple of $\mathsf{h}$). Define then $\mathsf{e} := \lambda E$ and $\mathsf{f} := \sigma(\mathsf{e})$. Each $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\mathsf{e}', \mathsf{h}', \mathsf{f}' \in \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ with $\sigma(\mathsf{e}') = \mathsf{f}'$ is called *$\sigma$–adapted* in the following.

**12.6.** Complexifying $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \ltimes_{\varrho} \mathbb{R}^2$, we briefly discuss how the 2-dimensional abelian radical $\mathbb{C}^2$, considered as an $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$-module, is related to the real structure. Let a $\sigma$-adapted $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}, \mathsf{f}$ be given. Let $\mathbb{C}^2 = V_+ \oplus V_-$ be the decomposition into $(\pm 1)$ $\mathsf{h}$-eigenspaces. They are interchanged by $\sigma$. We claim that there exists a $v_+ \in V_+$ with $v_- := \sigma(\mathsf{e})v_+ = \sigma(v_+) \neq 0$: Indeed, choose $w_+ \in V_+ \setminus \{0\}$ arbitrarily. Then there is a $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ with $\mathsf{f}w_+ = c\sigma(w_+)$, and a direct check shows $|c| = 1$. Choose a $b \in \mathbb{C}$ with $b^2 = \overline{c}$ and put $v_+ := b{\cdot}w_+$.
We use the linear basis $v_+, v_-$ of the radical $\mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l}) \cong \mathbb{C}^2$ in the following computations.

We now resume the proof of Claim 12.4. For short, write $\mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} := \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l})$ for the abelian radical. Since $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$, we can write $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{e}, w_1) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, w_2)$ for suitable $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Clearly, the $w_j$'s are not arbitrary: Write $w_1 = \lambda_1 v_+ + \mu_1 v_-$ and $w_2 = \lambda_2 v_+ + \mu_2 v_-$. Note that $w_2 \neq -\overline{w}_2$ (otherwise $\mathfrak{q} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{q} \neq 0$), i.e., $\lambda_2 \neq -\overline{\mu}_2$. The fact that $\mathfrak{q}$ is a subalgebra imposes a further condition on the coefficients $\lambda_j, \mu_j$ : A simple computation shows that $\mu_1 = 0$ and $\mu_2 = -\lambda_1$, i.e., for each $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\lambda \neq \overline{\mu}$ we have the two 2-dimensional complex subalgebras $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_{\lambda,\mu}$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{q}$ :

$$\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{e}, \lambda v_+) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, \mu v_+ - \lambda v_-), \qquad \sigma\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{f}, \overline{\lambda} v_-) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(-\mathsf{h}, -\overline{\lambda} v_+ + \overline{\mu} v_-)\,.$$

Recall the definition $\mathfrak{f} = \{u \in \mathfrak{q} : [u, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}\}$ from 9.5.iv. A straightforward calculation shows that in all cases $\mathfrak{f} = 0$ holds. This contradicts (IV) and proves 12.4. □

We proceed the proof of Lemma 12.2 by restricting the radical of $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{r}$ further:

**12.7 Claim.** *The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ cannot be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$.*
*Proof of the claim.* Assume to the contrary that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and denote by $\pi_1 : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$, $\pi_2 : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathbb{C}^2$ the canonical projections. As in the proof of the previous claim, the cases $\dim \mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{l}) \geq 1$ can be ruled out immediately. We therefore only have to exclude the case $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathbb{C}^2 = 0$: In that case, let $\mathfrak{b}$ be the 2-dimensional $\pi_1$-image in $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. It follows $\sigma(\mathfrak{b}) \neq \mathfrak{b}$ since otherwise $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) \subset \mathfrak{b}$ would contradict (III). Consequently there exist $\mathsf{e} \in \mathfrak{b}$, $\mathsf{h} \in \mathfrak{b} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathsf{f} = \sigma(\mathsf{e}) \in \sigma(\mathfrak{b}) = \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ with the properties described in 12.5. The fact that $\mathfrak{q}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ are subalgebras and that $\pi(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{h} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{e}$ determine $\mathfrak{q}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ as follows: $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, w) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{e}, 0)$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, -\overline{w}) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{f}, 0)$ for a $w \in \mathbb{C}^2$.
We may further assume that $w, \overline{w}$ are linearly independent, otherwise $\pi_2(\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) \neq \mathbb{C}^2$ would contradict (III). As a consequence, $(\mathsf{h}, 0) \notin \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$. The definition of $\mathfrak{f}$ then shows $\mathfrak{f} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, w)$. On the other hand, for this $\mathfrak{f}$ we have $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ in contradiction to (V). This proves the claim and Lemma 12.2. □

So far we know that under the assumption $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ necessarily $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{r}$, where $\mathfrak{r}$ is the 2-dimensional non-abelian Lie algebra. To determine the full CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ we still have to find out how the complex subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ sits inside $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$.

**12.8 Claim.** *Up to a CR-algebra automorphism of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ the subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ is obtained in the following way: Fix a linear basis $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{z}$ of $\mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with $[\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{z}] = \mathsf{z}$ and a $\sigma$–adapted $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple $\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}, \mathsf{f} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ (see 12.5 for the definition). Then $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{h}\,, 2\mathsf{x} + \mu\mathsf{z}) \,\oplus\, \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{e}\,, \nu\mathsf{z})$ for suitable $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Im}(\mu) = \pm 2$ and $|\nu| = 1$.*
*Proof of the claim.* The case $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ can clearly be excluded. If the intersection $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ would be 1-dimensional then $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} \;\oplus\; \sigma\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (as the sum $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ must be direct). Since $\mathfrak{f}$ must also be 1-dimensional, we have $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \mathfrak{q}$. But then $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f}$, violating condition (V).
It remains the case $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = 0$, i.e., $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{q})$ is a Borel subalgebra $\mathbb{C}\mathsf{e} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{h}$, and $\pi(\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{h} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{f}$ where $\mathsf{h}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{f} \in \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ are chosen as explained in 12.5. Since $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a Lie sub*algebra*, it necessarily has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, \lambda\mathsf{x} + \mu\mathsf{z}) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{e}, \nu\mathsf{z}) \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(-\mathsf{h}, \overline{\lambda}\mathsf{x} + \overline{\mu}\mathsf{z}) \oplus \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{f}, \overline{\nu}\mathsf{z}) \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{and} \quad \lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C} \quad \text{satisfying} \quad \lambda = 2 \ \text{ if } \ \nu \neq 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{12.9}$$

***$\nu$ = 0:*** Then $\lambda\mathsf{x} + \mu\mathsf{z}$ and $\overline{\lambda}\mathsf{x} + \overline{\mu}\mathsf{z}$ must be linearly independent in $\mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$, i.e., $\lambda\overline{\mu} \neq \overline{\lambda}\mu$ (otherwise $\pi_{\mathfrak{r}}(\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) \neq \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$). Observe that $(\mathsf{h}, 0) \notin \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. A direct verification shows $\mathfrak{f} = \mathbb{C}{\cdot}(\mathsf{h}, \lambda\mathsf{x} + \mu\mathsf{z})$ if $\lambda \in i\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathfrak{f} = 0$ otherwise. But then $\mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ is a subalgebra in contradiction to (V).
***$\nu \neq$ 0:*** Possibly after replacing $\mathsf{z}$ by $|\nu|\mathsf{z}$ we may assume $|\nu| = 1$ in (12.9). Employing the definition of $\mathfrak{f}$ in 9.5.iv, a simple calculation shows

$$\mathfrak{f} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{h} \mp 2i\overline{\nu}\,\mathsf{e}\,,\ 2\mathsf{x} + \mathrm{Re}(\mu)\mathsf{z}) & \mathrm{Im}(\mu) = \pm 2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{12.10}$$

that is, $\mathfrak{f}$ is 1-dimensional only if $\mathrm{Im}\,\mu = \pm 2$. This proves the claim. □

**12.11 Lemma.** *For the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ in 12.8 the associated CR-germ $(M, o)$ is CR-equivalent to $(\mathcal{M}, a)$, where $\mathcal{M}$ is the tube over the future light cone.*

*Proof.* We start by giving a particular representing manifold for the associated germ, compare Example 6.6 in [19]. Let $\mu, \nu$ be the constants occurring in 12.8 and consider the affine quadric $Z := \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \subset \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$, on which the group $\widehat{L} := \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ acts holomorphically by $z \mapsto gzh^{-1}$ for all $(g, h) \in \widehat{L}$.

Then $\widehat{G} := \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ is a real form of $\widehat{L}$. Via

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{x} := \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathsf{z} := \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \in \mathfrak{r} \\ &\mathsf{e} := \frac{\nu}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathsf{h} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathsf{f} := \sigma(\mathsf{e}) \quad \in \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}}\end{aligned} \tag{12.12}$$

we consider $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ as a complex subalgebra of $\widehat{\mathfrak{l}} = \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ as a subalgebra of $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}$. We recall some basic facts, compare [19]: The polynomial function $\psi(z) := \det(z + \overline{z}) - 2$ on $Z$ is invariant under the action of the group $\widehat{G}$. Furthermore, the nonsingular part $M$ of the algebraic subset $S := \psi^{-1}\big(\{\pm 2\}\big)$ is a (non-connected) hypersurface in $Z$, locally CR-equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$. On the other hand, the singular part of $S$ is a totally real submanifold of $Z$. Consider the point

$$o := \frac{e^{-\pi i/4}}{4}\begin{pmatrix} 4+\mu & -\mu \\ i\mu & i(4-\mu) \end{pmatrix} \in Z$$

which actually is in $S$ because of $\psi(o) = \mathrm{Im}(\mu)$. A direct computation shows that the isotropy subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}_o$ of $\mathfrak{l} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{l}}$ at $o \in Z$ is $\mathbb{C}(\mathsf{h}, 2\mathsf{x} + \mu\mathsf{z}) \oplus \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{e}, \nu\mathsf{z})$ and that the isotropy subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{g}}$ at $o$ is trivial. This implies $a \in M$ and also that the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is associated to the germ $(M, o)$. Since $M$ is locally CR-equivalent to the tube $\mathcal{M}$ over the future light cone the proof for 12.11 is complete. ☐

## 13. The case $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$

The status of our proof so far can be summarized as follows: For the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ satisfying 9.8 and $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}} \neq 0$ the simple ideal $\mathfrak{s}$ of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ can only by isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ or $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, Furthermore, the case $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$ only occurs if the associated CR-germ is equivalent to $(\mathcal{M}, o)$ with $\mathcal{M}$ being the light cone tube, and then $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{r}$ with nonabelian 2-dimensional $\mathfrak{r}$. Consequently, only the situation needs to be investigated when $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ only contains simple ideals isomorphic to $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. We assume this throughout this section and state as main lemma:

**13.1 Lemma.** *There is no simple factor of* $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ *isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{su}(2)$.

The *proof* will be subdivided into several claims. Note that contrary to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, the only non-trivial proper subalgebras of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ are 1-dimensional tori. As before let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a fixed simple factor of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ and denote by $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{s}$ the canonical projection. Then the image $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ must be a proper subalgebra since otherwise $\mathfrak{g}' = \pi^{-1}(0)$ would violate $(\mathsf{VI})_2$. Our first observation is

**13.2 Claim.** *For* $\mathfrak{g}$ *and* $\mathfrak{r} := \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ *only the following cases may occur*

$$\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{r}, \qquad \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \qquad \text{or}$$
$$\mathfrak{g} \cong \big(\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)\big) \ltimes \mathfrak{r} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathfrak{r} \neq 0 \ \text{ and } \ \mathfrak{g}_o = (\mathbb{R}\mathsf{t}_1 \times \mathbb{R}\mathsf{t}_2) \ltimes (\mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{r}) \ \text{ for } \ \mathsf{t}_j \in \mathfrak{su}(2)\,.$$

*Proof of the claim.* Write $\mathfrak{g} = (\mathfrak{s}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{s}_2 \oplus \mathfrak{s}'') \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$ where $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2 \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$, $\mathfrak{s}''$ is the complementary ideal in $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{ss}}$ and $\pi_j$ denotes the projection onto $\mathfrak{s}_1$ or $\mathfrak{s}_2$, respectively. Only one of the following possibilities could occur:

- $\pi_1(\mathfrak{g}_o) = 0$. Then $\mathfrak{s}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{s}_2$ is already a transitive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{s}'' = \mathfrak{r} = 0$.
- $\pi_1(\mathfrak{g}_o) \neq 0 \neq \pi_2(\mathfrak{g}_o)$. Then either $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{s}_2$ or $\mathfrak{g}_o \cap (\mathfrak{s}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{s}_2) = (\mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{s}_1) \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{s}_2) = \mathbb{R}\mathsf{t}_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\mathsf{t}_2$ for suitable nonzero $\mathsf{t}_1, \mathsf{t}_2 \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$. In the latter case $\mathfrak{g}_o \cap (\mathfrak{s}'' \ltimes \mathfrak{r})$ is of codimension 1 in $\mathfrak{s}'' \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$. But then we conclude that $\mathfrak{s}'' = 0$ as there is no 1-codimensional subalgebras in $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. ☐

For the proof of 13.1 we only need to investigate the above three types of $\mathfrak{g}$. We repeatedly use the fact that each 1- or 2-dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2) \cong \mathfrak{so}(3)$ is trivial and that each toral subalgebra $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{su}(2)$ acts irreducibly on $\mathfrak{su}(2)/\mathfrak{t}$.

**13.3 Claim.** $\mathfrak{g} \cong (\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)) \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$ *implies* $\mathfrak{r} = 0$.

*Proof of the claim.* Let $\pi_1, \pi_2$ be the projection onto the first and the second simple factor, respectively. As observed in the preceeding Claim, $\mathfrak{g}_o = (\mathfrak{t}_1 \times \mathfrak{t}_2) \ltimes \mathfrak{r}_o$ with $\mathfrak{r}_o := \mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{r}$ and 1-dimensional toral subalgebras $\mathfrak{t}_j$. Recall that we have the $\mathfrak{g}_o$-stable filtration $\mathfrak{g} \supset \mathfrak{H} \supset \mathfrak{F} \supset \mathfrak{g}_o$. At least one of the images $\pi_j(\mathfrak{F})$ coincides with $\mathfrak{s}_j$, say, for $j = 2$. Since $\mathfrak{t}_j$ acts irreducibly on $\mathfrak{s}_j/\mathfrak{t}_j$, it follows $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{s}_2 \ltimes \mathfrak{r}_o$. Since then $\mathfrak{H} \cap \mathfrak{s}$ is at least 2-dimensional, the irreducibility of the action of $\mathfrak{t}_1$ implies $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{s}_2 \ltimes \mathfrak{r}_o$. But this would imply $[\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{H}$, contradicting (III). □

**13.4 Claim.** $\mathfrak{g} \not\cong \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$.

*Proof of the Claim.* Suppose to the contrary that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. Since $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a subalgebra of dimension 3 and there is no solvable subalgebra of this dimension, necessarily $\mathfrak{F} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$. Consequently, either $\mathfrak{F}$ is one of the simple factors of $\mathfrak{g}$ or $\mathfrak{F}$ is the graph of an automorphism of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Both possibilities lead to a contradiction: In the first case $\mathfrak{F}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$, contradicting (V), and in the second case $\mathfrak{F}$ acts irreducibly on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{F}$, violating the existence of the $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{F})$-stable proper subspace $\mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{F}$. □

The remaining case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{su}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$ with $\mathfrak{r} := \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the most involved. In this situation the projection of $\mathfrak{g}_o$ under the canonical projection $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{su}(2)$ is of dimension $\leq 1$. As usual we denote the canonical projection $\mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ by the same symbol $\pi$. We investigate the various possibilities for the $\pi$-images of the Lie subalgebras $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ defined in (9.4).

- $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) = \pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\mathfrak{q})$. Since $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o)$ is a $\sigma$-stable torus, it would follow $\pi(\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \pi(\mathfrak{l}_o)$. Counting dimensions, this cannot happen.
- $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\mathfrak{q})$. Here, we have to rule out the 2 possibilities $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) \leq 1$.

If $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) = 0$ then $\pi(\mathfrak{F})$ is a 1-dimensional toral subalgebra in $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, and consequently $\pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\mathfrak{q}) = \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ is 1-dimensional. This contradicts the fact that $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ is a hyperplane in $\mathfrak{l}$. It remains the case when $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o)$ is 1-dimensional. Then $\pi(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{s}$, and possibly after replacing $\mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$ by the Levi factor contained in $\mathfrak{F}$ we may assume that $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{F}$. By dimension reasons $\mathfrak{r}_o := \mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{F} \cap \mathfrak{r}$. Further, $\mathfrak{r}_o$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{F}$ and we have $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{s} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}_o$ as well as $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{s} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{H}}$ with $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{H}} := \mathfrak{H} \cap \mathfrak{r}$. Since $\dim \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{H}} - \dim \mathfrak{r}_o = 2$, the ad-representation of $\mathfrak{s}$ on $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{H}}/\mathfrak{r}_o$ is trivial, i.e., $[\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{H}}] \subset \mathfrak{r}_o$. Since $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{l}_o \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{y}$ for some $\mathsf{y} \in \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{q} = \sigma\mathfrak{f} \oplus \mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{x}}$ for some $\overline{\mathsf{x}} \in \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathfrak{H}}$, we would have $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] = [\mathfrak{l}_o \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{y}, \sigma\mathfrak{f} \oplus \mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{x}}] \subset \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f}$, in contradiction to (V).

- $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) = \pi(\mathfrak{f}) \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{q})$. The possibility $0 = \pi(\mathfrak{f})$ can be excluded since otherwise $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f}$ would be an ideal in $\mathfrak{l}$, contradicting condition (V). Next we deal with the case when $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) = \pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\sigma\mathfrak{f})$ is a (1-dimensional) toral subalgebra. By assumption $\mathfrak{b} := \pi(\mathfrak{q})$ is then 2-dimensional, i.e., a Borel subalgebra, which implies that $\mathfrak{b} + \sigma\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$, or equivalently $\pi(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathfrak{s}$. Counting dimensions, $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{F}} := \mathfrak{F} \cap \mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{H} \cap \mathfrak{r}$. Further, $[\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{r} \cap \mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ and since, due to condition (III), $\mathfrak{H}$ generates $\mathfrak{g}$ as a Lie algebra, we deduce that $\mathfrak{r}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$. From $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) = \pi(\mathfrak{f})$ follows that $\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{l}_o \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{r}$ with $\mathsf{r} \in \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathfrak{F}}$. But this implies $[\mathfrak{f}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] = [\mathfrak{l}_0 \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{r}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \sigma\mathfrak{q} + \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathfrak{F}} \subset \sigma\mathfrak{q} \oplus \mathfrak{f}$, violating (V). It remains one last possibility for the flag $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ in $\mathfrak{l}$:

**13.5 Claim.** *If* $\pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{f}) \subsetneq \pi(\mathfrak{q})$ *then* $\mathfrak{l}_o = 0$ *and* $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{r}$ *with* $\mathfrak{r} := \mathfrak{rad}(\mathfrak{g})$ *of dimension 2.*

*Proof of the claim.* The properness of the inclusions implies $\mathfrak{l}_o \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} = \sigma\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{q}$ generate $\mathfrak{l}$ as a Lie algebra, it follows that $\mathfrak{l}_o \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{l}$, or equivalently $\mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{r} \lhd \mathfrak{g}$. By the effectivity assumption $(\mathsf{VI})_1$, we have $\mathfrak{g}_o \cap \mathfrak{r} = 0$. Consequently, since $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) \leq 1$ the same estimate holds for $\dim \mathfrak{l}_o$. Next we show that the case $1 = \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \pi(\mathfrak{g}_o)$ $(= \dim \pi(\mathfrak{l}_o) = \dim \mathfrak{l}_o)$ cannot happen: Assume on the contrary that $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o) = 1$. Then $\pi(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{s}$ and, possibly after replacing the Levi factor $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ by a conjugate one, we may assume $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{F}$. Counting dimensions yields then $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{s} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2)$. Since $[\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{H}$ by (II), we have a representation of $\mathfrak{s}$ on $\mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{F}$. But this yields the contradiction as $\dim \mathfrak{H}/\mathfrak{F} = 2$, compare (I), implies that this representation is trivial, i.e. $[\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{H}] = [\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{F}$, violating (V).

We have proved that the only possibility for $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathfrak{su}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$ with a 2-dimensional radical $\mathfrak{r}$. Since $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ can act only trivially on such an $\mathfrak{r}$, the above semidirect product is in fact direct. This proves the claim. □

**13.6 Claim.** *The case* $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{r}$, $\dim \mathfrak{r} = 2$, *also cannot occur.*

*Proof of the claim.* We write $\pi = \pi_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\pi_{\mathfrak{r}}$ for the projections onto $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}}$, respectively. The proof analyses various possibilities for $\mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{q}$.

If $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{F}) = 0$ then $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{r}$ would be an ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ contradicting $(\mathsf{V})$. It remains the case when $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{F})$ as well as $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{f})$ is 1-dimensional. In that situation necessarily $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{q}) \neq \pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{f})$, and $\pi(\mathfrak{q})$ is a Borel subalgebra in $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Further, $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{q}) + \sigma(\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{b})) = \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{q}) \cap \pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\sigma\mathfrak{b})$ is a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Similar to the situation considered in 12.5 we also can choose here a *standard triple* $\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{f}, \mathsf{h} \in \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\pi_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{h} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{e}$ and $\sigma(\mathsf{h}) = -\mathsf{h}$, but now $\sigma(\mathsf{e}) = -\mathsf{f}$ for the Cartan involution $\sigma$. The radical $\mathfrak{r}$ cannot be abelian: Otherwise, exactly as in the proof of Claim 12.7, we obtain a contradiction. In the remaining non-abelian case we proceed as in the proof of Claim 12.8 by investigating the various positions of $\mathfrak{q}$ in $\mathfrak{l}$: The cases $\dim \mathfrak{r}^{\mathbb{C}} \cap \mathfrak{q} > 0$ are easily ruled out (same argument as in the proof of 12.8, following (12.9)). Hence, we may assume that $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{q}$ are given by the formula (12.9), except that now $\sigma\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}\cdot(-\mathsf{h}, \overline{\lambda}\mathsf{x} + \overline{\mu}\mathsf{z}) \oplus \mathbb{C}\cdot(-\mathsf{f}, \overline{\nu}\mathsf{z})$, i.e., the sign in front of $\mathsf{f}$ has changed. This slight difference is precisely the reason why in case $\nu \neq 0$, contrary to (12.10), the CR-germ $(M, o)$ associated to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ would be Levi nondegenerate, as shown by a simple computation. This contradicts our fundamental assumption and concludes the proof of the claim as well as the proof of Proposition 13.1. $\square$

## 14. Reduction to the case where $\mathfrak{g}$ is solvable and of dimension 5

Striking the balance for the proof of Theorem II obtained so far, we have shown the following:

*Let* $(M, o)$ *be an arbitrary locally homogeneous* 2*-nondegenerate CR-germ of dimension* 5 *and let* $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ *be an associated CR-algebra. If the Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is not solvable then* $M$ *is locally CR-equivalent at* $o \in M$ *to the tube* $\mathcal{M}$ *over the future light cone.*

For the rest of the proof we therefore assume that every CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ under consideration satisfies the fundamental assumption 9.8 and that $\mathfrak{g}$ is solvable. As main result of this section we show

**14.1 Lemma.** *The solvable Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g}$ *has dimension* 5*, i.e.,* $\mathfrak{g}_o = 0$.

The *proof* of this Lemma will be subdivided into several steps. Recall that by definition the *nilradical* $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the maximal nilpotent ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$. It is well-known that $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ contains the commutator subalgebra $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$, and each element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ is ad-nilpotent in $\mathfrak{g}$. Similarly, we denote the (complex) nilradical of $\mathfrak{l}$ by $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$. We retain the notation from 9.4 and 9.5.

**14.2 Claim.** $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$.
*Proof of the claim.* Since $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$, the quotient $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ is abelian. Let $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ be the projection. Assume that $\mathfrak{g}_o \not\subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$, i.e., $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o) \neq 0$. Select a subalgebra $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ (possibly 0) which is a complement of $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o)$. But then $\mathfrak{g}' := \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{r})$ would violate $(\mathsf{VI})_2$. Consequently we necessarily have $\pi(\mathfrak{g}_o) = 0$, i.e., $\mathfrak{g}_o \subset \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ as claimed. $\square$

**14.3.** Recall that for the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ under consideration there exist flags $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{f} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \sigma\mathfrak{f} \subset \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ of subalgebras in $\mathfrak{l}$, as defined in 9.4. For the subsequent considerations we select the following elements in $\mathfrak{l}$: $\mathsf{y} \in \mathfrak{f} \setminus \mathfrak{l}_o$ and $\mathsf{x} \in \mathfrak{q} \setminus \mathfrak{f}$, and write $\overline{\mathsf{x}} := \sigma(\mathsf{x})$ and $\overline{\mathsf{y}} := \sigma(\mathsf{y})$, for short. Then

$$\mathfrak{f} = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{y} \oplus \mathfrak{l}_o, \quad \mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{x} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{y} \oplus \mathfrak{l}_o, \quad \sigma\mathfrak{f} = \mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{y}} \oplus \mathfrak{l}_o \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{x}} \oplus \mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{y}} \oplus \mathfrak{l}_o\,.$$

The inclusion $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ is guaranteed by 14.2. Hence, $\mathfrak{l}_o$ acts by ad-nilpotent endomorphisms on $\mathfrak{l}$. In particular, $[\mathfrak{l}_o, \mathfrak{f}] \subset \mathfrak{l}_o$ and $[\mathfrak{l}_o, \mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{f}$. The condition $(\mathsf{III})$ means that $[\mathsf{x}, \overline{\mathsf{x}}] \notin \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$, and $(\mathsf{V})$ is equivalent to $[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}] \notin \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$.
Let $\mathfrak{z} \subset \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ be the center of the nilradical (which is nontrivial if $\mathfrak{l} \neq 0$), to which we refer as to the *nilcenter* of $\mathfrak{l}$. As for every characteristic ideal, we have $\sigma(\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}) = \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ and $\sigma(\mathfrak{z}) = \mathfrak{z}$.

**14.4 Claim.** (i) *The nilcenter* $\mathfrak{z}$ *of* $\mathfrak{l}$ *is not contained in* $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$.

(ii) $\mathfrak{l}_o = 0$ *if* $\dim \mathfrak{z} \geq 2$.

*Proof.* **ad (i):** Assume that (i) is not true and let $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}, \overline{\mathsf{x}}, \overline{\mathsf{y}} \in \mathfrak{l}$ be as in 14.3. Let $\zeta := a\mathsf{x} + \overline{a\mathsf{x}} + b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b}\overline{\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o$, $\gamma_o \in \mathfrak{g}_o$, $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$, be an arbitrary element in $\mathfrak{z}^{\sigma}$. Then $[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \zeta] \in \mathfrak{z} \subset \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ since $\mathfrak{z}$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{l}$. On the other hand

$$[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, a\mathsf{x} + \overline{a\mathsf{x}} + b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b}\overline{\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o] = a[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{x}] + [\overline{\mathsf{x}}, b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b}\overline{\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o] \equiv a[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{x}] \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}\,,$$

which implies $a = 0$. This shows that $\mathfrak{z} \subset (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f})$. Given then $\zeta = b\mathsf{y}+\overline{b\mathsf{y}}+\gamma_o \in \mathfrak{z}^\sigma$, the inclusion $[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \zeta] \subset \mathfrak{z}$ holds since $\mathfrak{z}$ is an ideal. On the other hand

$$[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o\ ] = b[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}] + [\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o] \equiv b[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}] \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}\ .$$

Hence, $b = 0$ as the consequence of the above equation and (V). But this cannot be true since then $\mathfrak{z} \subset \mathfrak{l}_o$ would be a nontrivial ideal of $\mathfrak{l}$, violating $(\mathsf{VI})_1$.

**ad (ii):** Assume $\dim \mathfrak{z} \geq 2$, i.e. $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) \neq 0$. Recall that $\mathfrak{l}_o \subset \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ by 14.2 and consequently $[\mathsf{y}, \mathfrak{l}_o] \subset \mathfrak{l}_o$, $[\overline{\mathsf{y}}, \mathfrak{l}_o] \subset \mathfrak{l}_o$. Let an arbitrary $\zeta := a\mathsf{x} + \overline{a\mathsf{x}} + b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o \in \mathfrak{z}^\sigma \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ be given. Computing its bracket with $\mathfrak{l}_o$ we obtain:

$$[\zeta, \mathfrak{l}_o] = a[\mathsf{x}, \mathfrak{l}_o] + \overline{a}[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathfrak{l}_o] \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{l}_o\ .$$

Either $a = 0$ for all such $\zeta$, and then $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f})$, or $a \neq 0$, and then $[\mathsf{x}, \mathfrak{l}_o] \subset \mathfrak{l}_o \supset [\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathfrak{l}_o]$. In the latter case it follows that $\mathfrak{l}_o$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{l}$ (due to 9.7.$\mathsf{III}$, $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}, \overline{\mathsf{x}}, \overline{\mathsf{y}}$ and $\mathfrak{l}_o$ generate $\mathfrak{l}$ as a Lie algebra), hence, $\mathfrak{l}_o = 0$ as claimed. The other possibility would be $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f})$ and we show that this cannot happen: Given an arbitrary $\zeta = b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o \in \mathfrak{z}^\sigma \cap (\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f})$, note that

$$[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \zeta] \in \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f}).$$

More explicitly, $[\overline{\mathsf{x}}\,,\, b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o] = b[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}] + [\overline{\mathsf{x}}\,,\, \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o] \in b[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}] + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$. But then the above equation together with (V) would imply $b = 0$, i.e., $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap \mathfrak{l}_o \neq 0$. This is absurd, as

$$[\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{z} \cap \mathfrak{l}_o] \subset \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap \mathfrak{l}_o \neq 0,$$

i.e., since $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ generates $\mathfrak{l}$ as a Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{z} \cap \mathfrak{l}_o$ would be a nontrivial ideal in $\mathfrak{l}$. □

In remains the case when the nilcenter is 1-dimensional.

**14.5 Claim.** *Suppose* $\dim \mathfrak{z} = 1$. *Then* $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ *and* $\mathfrak{g}_o = \mathfrak{l}_o = 0$.

*Proof.* Since $\mathfrak{z} \not\subset \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ by 14.4, the sum $\mathfrak{z} + (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ is direct. Recall that the recursively defined subspaces $C_0(\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}) := 0$, $C_k := C_k(\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}) := \{u \in \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}} : [u, \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}] \subset C_{k-1}(\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}})\}$ for every $k > 0$ form the ascending central series of $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{z} = C_1$ and $\sigma(C_k) = C_k$ for all $k$. Either $\mathfrak{z} = C_1 = C_2 = \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ and consequently $\mathfrak{l}_o = 0$ (due to $(\mathsf{VI})_1$ $\mathfrak{l}_o$ must be a proper subalgebra of the 1-dimensional algebra $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$) or $C_1 \neq C_2$. In the latter case $C_2 \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) \neq 0$. Let $\eta = a\mathsf{x} + \overline{a\mathsf{x}} + b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o \in C_2^\sigma \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ be arbitrary. Since $[\eta, \mathfrak{l}_o] \subset \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = 0$, we have

$$[\eta, \mathfrak{l}_o] \equiv a[\mathsf{x}, \mathfrak{l}_o] + \overline{a}[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathfrak{l}_o] \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{l}_o\,.$$

If $a \neq 0$ then $[\mathsf{x}, \mathfrak{l}_o], [\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathfrak{l}_o] \subset \mathfrak{l}_o$ and $\mathfrak{l}_o$ is an ideal in $\mathfrak{l}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{l}_o = 0$ by $(\mathsf{VI})_1$. If $a = 0$ for every choice of $\eta \in C_2^\sigma \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ as above, then $C_2 \cap (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = C_2 \cap (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f})$. This possibility can be ruled out as follows: For a nonzero $\eta = b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o \in C_2^\sigma \cap (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f})$ we have $[\eta, \mathsf{x}] \in (\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) \cap C_2 = (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f}) \cap C_2$, i.e.,

$$[b\mathsf{y} + \overline{b\mathsf{y}} + \gamma_o, \mathsf{x}] = \overline{b}[\overline{\mathsf{y}}, \mathsf{x}]\ + ([b\mathsf{y} + \gamma_o, \mathsf{x}]) \equiv 0 \mod (\mathfrak{f}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{f})\,,$$

which is only possible if $\overline{b} = 0$. This would imply $(\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) \cap C_2 = \mathfrak{l}_o \cap C_2$. On the other hand, the identity $(\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) \cap\ C_2 = \mathfrak{l}_o \cap C_2$ implies that $\mathfrak{l}_o \cap C_2$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{l}$. The effectivity of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ forces then $\mathfrak{l}_o \cap C_2 = 0$, contradicting $(\mathfrak{q}{+}\sigma\mathfrak{q}) \cap C_2 \neq 0$. This completes the proof of 14.5 and, together with 14.2, 14.4 also the proof of Lemma 14.1. □

## 15. The existence of a 3-dimensional abelian ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ suffices

The proof of Theorem II has brought us to the point where we may and do henceforth assume that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ in the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ satisfying 9.8 is solvable. The subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus i\mathfrak{g}$ then necessarily is of complex dimension 2.

The main result 15.14 of this section states that the CR-germ associated to $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ is represented by the tube $F+i\mathbb{R}^3$ over an affinely homogeneous surface $F\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ if $\mathfrak{g}$ is isomorphic to a semidirect product $\mathfrak{h}\ltimes\mathfrak{r}$ with $\mathfrak{h}$ being a 2-dimensional Lie subalgebra and $\mathfrak{r}\cong\mathbb{R}^3$ being an abelian ideal. Once this Main Lemma is proved, our proof of the classification theorem will be complete as soon as we can show that every 5-dimensional solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ occurring in $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ indeed is isomorphic to a semidirect product as above. This will be achieved in the final section 16. In this section we only prove the partial result that if $\mathfrak{q}$ is abelian, then also the commutator $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ is abelian and 3-dimensional. Moreover, there exists an abelian subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{h}\ltimes[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$.

Since there is no general structure theory for solvable Lie algebras, we develop ad hoc methods and describe the structure constants in $\mathfrak{l}=\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with respect to a particularly chosen basis. Every CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ under consideration gives rise to the 1-dimensional subalgebras $\mathfrak{f}$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{f}$ of the 2-dimensional subalgebras $\mathfrak{q}$ and $\sigma\mathfrak{q}$, respectively. We construct a basis of $\mathfrak{l}$ which reflects the conditions (I)-(V) and investigate the various possibilities for the values of the corresponding structure constants. Select a non-zero $\mathsf{z}\in\mathfrak{z}^{-\sigma}\setminus(\mathfrak{q}+\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ (this is possible due to Claim 14.5) and an $\mathsf{x}\in\mathfrak{q}\setminus\mathfrak{f}$ such that for $\overline{\mathsf{x}}:=\sigma\mathsf{x}$ the congruence $[\mathsf{x},\overline{\mathsf{x}}]\equiv\mathsf{z}\mod\mathfrak{q}+\sigma\mathfrak{q}$ holds (this is possible due to (III)). By (V) it is further possible to select $\mathsf{y}\in\mathfrak{f}\setminus\mathfrak{l}_o$ such that for $\overline{\mathsf{y}}:=\sigma\mathsf{y}$ the structure equations of $\mathfrak{l}$ are of the following form (in particular, the coefficient in front of $\overline{\mathsf{x}}$ in the second equation is $b_2=1$):

$$\begin{array}{rcl} [\mathsf{x},\overline{\mathsf{x}}] &=& \mathsf{z}+a_1\mathsf{x}-\overline{a}_1\overline{\mathsf{x}}+a_2\mathsf{y}-\overline{a}_2\overline{\mathsf{y}}\\ [\mathsf{x},\overline{\mathsf{y}}] &=& b_1\mathsf{x}+\overline{\mathsf{x}}+b_3\mathsf{y}+b_4\overline{\mathsf{y}}\\ [\mathsf{y},\overline{\mathsf{y}}] &=& c\mathsf{y}-\overline{c}\overline{\mathsf{y}}\\ [\mathsf{y},\mathsf{x}] &=& d_1\mathsf{x}+d_2\mathsf{y}\\ [\mathsf{z},\eta] &\in& \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}})\qquad\text{for every }\eta\in\mathfrak{l}\,. \end{array}\tag{15.1}$$

The brackets $[\mathsf{y},\overline{\mathsf{x}}]$ and $[\overline{\mathsf{y}},\overline{\mathsf{x}}]$ are completely determined by the above 5 equations due to the fact that $\sigma:\mathfrak{l}\to\mathfrak{l}$ is an antilinear Lie algebra automorphism. Of course, not for all values of the constants the above identities give rise to a Lie *algebra*. In fact the above structure constants $a_1,\dots,d_2$, are subject to further constraints, imposed by (1) the Jacobi identity, (2) our assumption that $\mathfrak{l}$ is solvable and, (3) our assumption $\mathsf{z}\in\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}})$.

Conversely, let a 5-dimensional solvable complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}=\mathbb{C}\mathsf{z}\oplus\mathbb{C}\mathsf{x}\oplus\mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{x}}\oplus\mathbb{C}\mathsf{y}\oplus\mathbb{C}\overline{\mathsf{y}}$ be given with structure equations as in (15.1) (together with $[\overline{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{y}]=\mathsf{x}+\overline{b}_1\overline{\mathsf{x}}+\overline{b}_4\mathsf{y}+\overline{b}_3\overline{\mathsf{y}}$ and $[\overline{\mathsf{y}},\overline{\mathsf{x}}]=\overline{d}_1\overline{\mathsf{x}}+\overline{d}_2\overline{\mathsf{y}}$) for certain $a_1,..,d_2\in\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathsf{z}\in\mathfrak{z}^{-\sigma}$, where $\mathfrak{z}$ is the nilcenter of $\mathfrak{l}$. Define

$$\mathfrak{g}:=\mathbb{R}\,i\mathsf{z}\oplus\mathbb{R}(\mathsf{x}+\overline{\mathsf{x}})\oplus\mathbb{R}(i\mathsf{x}-i\overline{\mathsf{x}})\oplus\mathbb{R}(\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mathsf{y}})\oplus\mathbb{R}(i\mathsf{y}-i\overline{\mathsf{y}})\quad\text{and}\quad\mathfrak{q}:=\mathbb{C}\mathsf{x}\oplus\mathbb{C}\mathsf{y}\ .$$

Then the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ satisfies the fundamental assumption 9.8.

As already mentioned, besides the geometrically motivated conditions 9.7, which already are incorporated in (15.1), further conditions affect the particular values of the structure constants, for example those given by the Jacobi identity. We use $[[\xi_1,\xi_2,\xi_3]]:=[[\xi_1,\xi_2],\xi_3]+[[\xi_2,\xi_3],\xi_1]+[[\xi_3,\xi_1],\xi_2]$ as shorthand. The identity $[[\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y},\overline{\mathsf{y}}]]=0$ implies

$$|c|=1,\qquad d_1=\overline{c}-\overline{b}_1\qquad\text{and}\quad\overline{c}b_1\in\mathbb{R}\,.\tag{15.2}$$

**15.3 Remark.** From $c\neq0$, i.e., $[\mathsf{y},\overline{\mathsf{y}}]\neq0$, follows that the solvable subalgebra $\mathfrak{f}+\sigma\mathfrak{f}$, and in turn $\mathfrak{l}$, cannot be nilpotent.

Keeping in mind the identities (15.2) it is possible to readjust the basis $\mathsf{x},\dots,\mathsf{z}$ of $\mathfrak{l}$ as follows: Write $c=e^2$ for the coefficient $c$ in the third equation of (15.1) and replace $\mathsf{x}$ by $e\mathsf{x}$ as well as $\mathsf{y}$ by $c\mathsf{y}$. After this replacement the structure equations (15.1) keep their form, only $c$ changes to $c=1$ and $b_1$ becomes real.

*Notational agreement:* For the rest of this section we use $\alpha,\beta,\gamma$ and $\delta$ to denote real numbers, while

$a_j, b_j, c_j$ and $d_j$ stand for complex numbers. In particular, we write $\beta_1 := b_1$ to underline that the structure constant $b_1$ is real.

The Jacobi identity $[[\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}, \overline{\mathsf{y}}]] = 0$ implies further relations between the coefficients in the structure equations (15.1):

$$\begin{gathered} c = 1, \qquad \beta_1 := b_1 \in \mathbb{R} \\ d_1 = 1 - \beta_1\ , \qquad \overline{b}_3 - d_2 = b_4(\beta_1 - 1)\ , \qquad -\beta_1(b_3 + d_2) = b_4 - \overline{b}_4\ . \end{gathered} \tag{15.4}$$

**15.5 Perfect basis..** Summarizing, there exists a basis $\mathsf{z}, \mathsf{x}, \overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}, \overline{\mathsf{y}}$ ($\overline{\mathsf{x}} := \sigma(\mathsf{x}),\ \overline{\mathsf{y}} := \sigma(\mathsf{y})$) of $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\mathsf{z} \in \mathfrak{z}^{-\sigma} \setminus (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q})$ and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{x} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{y}$, $\mathfrak{f} = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{y}$ such that the corresponding structure constants in (15.1) satisfy (15.4). We call each such basis *perfect.*

There are still more constraints for the structure constants given by the Jacobi identity for further triples of elements and also by the fact that $\mathfrak{z}$ is in the center of $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$. Later on, we characterize these additional conditions more explicitly. For now, we elaborate the particular structure of the nilcenter:

**15.6 Lemma.** *The nilcenter* $\mathfrak{z} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ *has dimension 1 or 3.*

*Proof.* We closely analyze the conditions in 9.7 in order to get the dimension estimates. It is clear that $1 \le \dim \mathfrak{z} \le 4$, see Remark 15.3. Assume $\dim \mathfrak{z} = 4$. Then $\dim \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = 3$ follows by Lemma 14.4. But since $\mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f}$ is not abelian, i.e., $\dim \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f}) = 1$, there exist elements in $\mathfrak{z}$ of the form $\mathsf{x} + \eta_1, \overline{\mathsf{x}} + \eta_2$ with $\eta_j \in \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f}$. This leads to a contradiction: Indeed, on the one side $[\mathsf{x} + \eta_1, \overline{\mathsf{x}} + \eta_2] = 0$, and on the other side (V) implies $[\mathsf{x} + \eta_1, \overline{\mathsf{x}} + \eta_2] \equiv [\mathsf{x}, \overline{\mathsf{x}}] \not\equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$. Hence, we have proved that $1 \le \dim \mathfrak{z} \le 3$.

The main difficulty is to rule out the possibility $\dim \mathfrak{z} = 2$. Select a perfect basis in $\mathfrak{l}$ as described in 15.5 keeping in mind (15.1) and (15.4). We have to deal with 2 subcases.

**15.7 Claim.** *If* $[\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}] \ne 0$*, i.e.,* $\mathfrak{q}$ *is not abelian, then* $\dim \mathfrak{z} = 1$.
*Proof of the claim.* We first show that $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f})$. Select an arbitrary $\mathsf{z}' := \lambda\mathsf{x} + \overline{\lambda\mathsf{x}} + \mu\mathsf{y} + \overline{\mu\mathsf{y}} \in \mathfrak{z}^{\sigma} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q})$. We have to investigate the 2 possibilities '$\beta_1 \ne 1$' and '$\beta_1 = 1$': In the first case we get

$$[\mathsf{z}', (1 - \beta_1)\mathsf{x} + d_2\mathsf{y}] \equiv \overline{\lambda}(1 - \beta_1)[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{x}] \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q}$$

since $[\mathsf{y}, \mathsf{x}] \in \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$. Therefore$\lambda = 0$ by the condition (III), i.e., $\mathsf{z}' \in \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f}$. If $\beta_1 = 1$, i.e, $d_1 = 0$, then by our assumption $d_2 \ne 0$, and in turn $\mathsf{y} \in \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$. Hence, $[\mathsf{z}', \mathsf{y}] \equiv \overline{\lambda}[\overline{\mathsf{x}}, \mathsf{y}] \equiv 0 \mod \mathfrak{f} + \sigma\mathfrak{f}$, which, together with (V) also forces $\lambda = 0$. This proves $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f})$.
We claim that this identity can only h old if both sides vanish, i.e., $\dim \mathfrak{z} = 1$ by Lemma 14.4.i: Assuming to the contrary that $\mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) \ne 0$, then on the one hand there exists $\mathsf{z}' = \mu\mathsf{y} + \overline{\mu\mathsf{y}} \in \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f})$ with $\mu \ne 0$. On the other hand, $[\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{z}'] = [\mathsf{x}, \mu\mathsf{y} + \overline{\mu\mathsf{y}}] \in \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f})$ which in view of (V) is only possible if $\mu = 0$. This shows $\dim \mathfrak{z} = 1$.

It remains to rule out the second subcase:

**15.8 Claim.** *If* $[\mathsf{y}, \mathsf{x}] = 0$ *, i.e.,* $\mathfrak{q}$ *is abelian, then the commutator* $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}]$ *is a 3-dimensional abelian ideal. Further, if* $\dim \mathfrak{z} \ge 2$ *then* $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}] = \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ *and consequently* $\mathfrak{z} = [\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}]$ *is 3-dimensional.*

*Proof of the lemma.* This is the most involved case. The assumption $[\mathsf{y}, \mathsf{x}] = 0$, i.e, $d_1 = d_2 = 0$ implies $\beta_1 = 1$, $b_3 = 0$ and $b_4 := \beta_4 \in \mathbb{R}$, see the table below:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} [\mathsf{x}, \overline{\mathsf{x}}] & = & \mathsf{z} + a_1\mathsf{x} - \overline{a}_1\overline{\mathsf{x}} + a_2\mathsf{y} - \overline{a}_2\overline{\mathsf{y}} \\ [\mathsf{x}, \overline{\mathsf{y}}] & = & \mathsf{x} + \overline{\mathsf{x}} + \beta_4\overline{\mathsf{y}} \\ [\mathsf{y}, \overline{\mathsf{y}}] & = & \mathsf{y} - \overline{\mathsf{y}} \\ [\mathsf{y}, \mathsf{x}] & = & 0 \\ [\mathsf{z}, \eta] & = & c_\eta\mathsf{z} + \mathsf{q}_\eta \quad \eta \in \mathfrak{l},\ \mathsf{q}_\eta \in \mathfrak{z} \cap (\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q})\ . \end{array} \tag{15.9}$$

We need to analyze the relations between the structure constants in more detail. Let

$$\mathsf{q}_\mathsf{x} = z_1\mathsf{x} + z_2\overline{\mathsf{x}} + z_3\mathsf{y} + z_4\overline{\mathsf{y}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{q}_\mathsf{y} = w_1\mathsf{x} + w_2\overline{\mathsf{x}} + w_3\mathsf{y} + w_4\overline{\mathsf{y}}.$$

The fact that the $\mathsf{q}_\eta$ commute with all elements of $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}] \subset \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ (and in particular with $\mathsf{y}-\overline{\mathsf{y}}$) implies $z_1 = z_2$, $w_1 = w_2$ and $z_4 = z_1\beta_4 - z_3$, $w_4 = w_1\beta_4 - w_3$. The Jacobi identity $[[\mathsf{x},\overline{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{y}]] = 0$ yields

$$w_j = 0,\ c_{\mathsf{y}} = 1, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad [\mathsf{z},\mathsf{y}] = [\mathsf{z},\overline{\mathsf{y}}] = \mathsf{z}, \qquad a_1 = i\alpha_1, \qquad a_2 = \alpha_2 + \frac{i}{2}\alpha_1\beta_4\,, \tag{15.10}$$

for some $\alpha_1,\alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $[[\overline{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{y},\mathsf{z}]] = 0$ implies

$$\mathrm{Im}\, z_1 = 0, \qquad \mathrm{Re}\, z_3 = z_1\beta_4/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Re}\, c_{\mathsf{x}} = -\beta_4/2\,. \tag{15.11}$$

Summarizing,

$$[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}] = \mathbb{C}\mathsf{z} \,\oplus\, \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{x}+\overline{\mathsf{x}}+\frac{\beta_4}{2}\mathsf{y}+\frac{\beta_4}{2}\overline{\mathsf{y}}) \,\oplus\, \mathbb{C}(\mathsf{y}-\overline{\mathsf{y}})\,, \tag{15.12}$$

and, using the above relations between the structure constants, a simple check shows that this ideal is abelian. Moreover, the subset

$$\mathfrak{h} := \mathbb{R}\, i\big(\mathsf{x}-\overline{\mathsf{x}}+\frac{\beta_4}{2}\mathsf{y}-\frac{\beta_4}{2}\overline{\mathsf{y}}\big) \,\oplus\, \mathbb{R}(\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mathsf{y}}) \tag{15.13}$$

is an abelian subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ (and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus [\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$; in fact $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \ltimes [\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$).
It should be noted that the nilcenter $\mathfrak{z}$ may be 1-dimensional, and then $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ properly contains $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$.

We next show that the situation ‘$\dim\mathfrak{z} = 2$’ does not occur: Assume to the contrary that $\dim\mathfrak{z} = 2$. Then $\mathfrak{z}\cap(\mathfrak{q}\oplus\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ is nonzero. Let $\mathsf{z}' := \lambda\mathsf{x}+\overline{\lambda}\overline{\mathsf{x}}+\mu\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mu}\overline{\mathsf{y}} \in \mathfrak{z}^\sigma\cap(\mathfrak{q}\oplus\sigma\mathfrak{q})$ be arbitrary. Either, for all such $\mathsf{z}'$ the coefficient $\lambda$ is 0, i.e., $\mathfrak{z}\cap(\mathfrak{q}\oplus\sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{z}\cap(\mathfrak{f}\oplus\sigma\mathfrak{f})$, and then this case can be ruled out by a similar argument as in the proof of the above claim. Or, there exists $\mathsf{z}'$ with $\lambda \neq 0$. In such a situation the identity $[\mathsf{z}',\mathsf{y}-\overline{\mathsf{y}}] = 0$ implies $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^*$ and without loss of generality we may suppose $\mathsf{z}' = \mathsf{x}+\overline{\mathsf{x}}+z_3\mathsf{y}+\overline{z}_3\overline{\mathsf{y}}$ for some $z_3 \in \mathbb{C}$. The condition $[\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z}'] = 0$ gives $\mathrm{Re}\, z_3 = \beta_4/2$. But then $\mathsf{z}' = (\mathsf{x}+\overline{\mathsf{x}}+\beta_4/2\cdot(\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mathsf{y}})) + i\,\mathrm{Im}\, z_3\cdot(\mathsf{y}-\overline{\mathsf{y}}) \in [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$, compare (15.12). We claim, that in the situation under consideration, $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}} = [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$. To prove this, we simply compute the ad-action of $\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mathsf{y}}$ and $\mathsf{x}-\overline{\mathsf{x}}$ on $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$. Since $[\mathsf{x}-\overline{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{z}'] \in \mathbb{C}\mathsf{z}\oplus\mathbb{C}\mathsf{z}'$, the relation $\beta_4^2+4(\mathrm{Im}\, z_3)^2 = 4\alpha_1\mathrm{Im}\, z_3 + 4\alpha_2$ must also be fulfilled. Once again, a simple computation yields

$$\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mathsf{y}})\big|_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]} = -2\cdot\mathrm{id}, \qquad [\mathsf{x}-\overline{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{z}'] = 2\mathsf{z}+2i(\alpha_1-\mathrm{Im}\, z_3)\mathsf{z}'\,.$$

The above identities show that for every $\mathsf{v} := u_1\cdot(\mathsf{x}-\overline{\mathsf{x}}) + u_2(\mathsf{y}+\overline{\mathsf{y}}) + u_3\eta,\ u_j \in \mathbb{C},\ \eta \in [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$, the condition $[\mathsf{v},\mathsf{z}'] = 0$ implies $u_1 = u_2 = 0$, i.e., the centralizer $C_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathsf{z}')$ coincides with $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$. This proves $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}] = \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}} = C_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathsf{z}')$. But this is absurd, since then the nilcenter $\mathfrak{z}$ would coincide with the 3-dimensional abelian ideal $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$, contrary to our assumption ‘$\dim\mathfrak{z} = 2$’.

Finally, we need to investigate the case $\dim\mathfrak{z} = 3$. We claim that $\mathfrak{z} = [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}] = \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$: To see this, it enough to show that $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ is 3-dimensional, as, due to (15.12), $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$ is 3-dimensional, too. As already mentioned (see the sentence following (15.2)) $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ can be at most 4-dimensional. But the 4-dimensional case can be excluded, otherwise $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}} = \mathfrak{z}\oplus\mathbb{C}\mathsf{n}$ for $\mathsf{n} \in \mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}} \setminus [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$ which would imply that $\mathfrak{l}^{\mathrm{nil}}$ is abelian. Hence the nilradical is 3-dimensional. This proves 15.8 and Lemma 15.6. □

The next statement is one of the key points in our classification of 5-dimensional 2-nondegenerate homogeneous CR-germs. Before stating it we first fix some notation. Given a vector space $V$, write $\mathfrak{aff}(V)$ for the Lie algebra consisting of affine maps of $V$. This Lie algebra (as well as the corresponding Lie group $\mathrm{Aff}(V)$) has the natural semidirect product structure: $\mathfrak{aff}(V) = V \rtimes \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ (with $\mathfrak{gl}(V) = \{X \in \mathfrak{aff}(V) : X(0) = 0\}$). Let $\pi : \mathfrak{aff}(V) \to \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ be the projection homomorphism. We use similar notation on the Lie group level and write, for instance, $\pi : \mathrm{Aff}(V) = V \rtimes \mathrm{GL}(V) \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$ for the corresponding group homomorphism. Sometimes we simply write $\psi^{\mathrm{lin}} := \pi(\psi)$ for the linear part of an element in $\mathfrak{aff}(V)$ or $\mathrm{Aff}(V)$.

**15.14 Main Lemma.** *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ *be a CR-algebra satisfying the fundamental assumption* 9.8 *and let* $\mathfrak{g}$ *be solvable and of dimension 5. Suppose that there exists a 3-dimensional abelian ideal* $\mathfrak{v} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ *and a 2-dimensional subalgebra* $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ *with* $\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{v} = \{0\}$. *Then the associated CR-germ* $(M, o)$ *is locally CR-equivalent to a tube* $F \times i\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$*, where* $F \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *is an affinely homogeneous surface.*

The *proof* is divided in several steps which give more precise (but also more technical) information concerning the structure of the Lie groups corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{l}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ and a realization of the CR-germ $(M, o)$:

**15.15 Claim.** *The adjoint representation* $\mathrm{ad} : \mathfrak{h} \to \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{v})$ *is faithful. Consequently, identifying* $\mathfrak{h}$ *with the subalgebra* $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h}) \subset \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{v})$*, the Lie algebras* $\mathfrak{g}$ *and* $\mathfrak{l}$ *can be realized as Lie subalgebras of affine transformations:* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h}) \subset \mathfrak{aff}(\mathfrak{v}) \cong \mathfrak{aff}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and* $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathfrak{aff}(\mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \mathfrak{aff}(\mathbb{C}^3)$.
*Proof of the claim.* Let $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ be the kernel of the adjoint representation $\mathrm{ad} : \mathfrak{h} \to \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{v})$. The case $\dim \mathfrak{n} = 1$ can be excluded, otherwise $\mathfrak{n} \oplus \mathfrak{v} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}} = \mathfrak{z}$ would be 4-dimensional, contradicting Lemma 15.6. The case $\dim \mathfrak{n} = 2$ can be also excluded: Otherwise $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \times \mathfrak{h}$ would be abelian or contain a 4-dimensional abelian nilradical which in both cases would contradict (III) – (V). □

Write $V \cong \mathbb{R}^3$ for a vector group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{v}$ and $E := V^{\mathbb{C}}$ for its complexification. Let $H_{\mathrm{GL}} \subset \mathrm{GL}(V)$ and $H^{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathrm{GL}} \subset \mathrm{GL}(E)$ be the Lie subgroups, corresponding to the Lie algebras $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h})$ and $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}})$, respectively. Since $\mathrm{GL}(V) \cong \mathrm{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ contains no compact torus of dimension $\geq 2$, each subgroup, in particular $H_{\mathrm{GL}}$, is closed. This is in general not true for the complex subgroup $H^{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathrm{GL}}$. Let $H^{\mathbb{C}}$ be the simply connected Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$, $\mathrm{pr} : H^{\mathbb{C}} \to H^{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathrm{GL}} \subset \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}})$ the homomorphism induced by $\mathrm{ad} : \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}) \subset \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}})$ and $L := V^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes H^{\mathbb{C}}$. For simplicity, for each $h \in H^{\mathbb{C}}$ we also write $h^{\mathrm{lin}} \subset \mathrm{GL}(E)$ instead of $\pi(h)$. Let $G = V \rtimes H \subset L$ be the real form. Since every 2-dimensional Lie algebra is solvable, we deduce that also $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (as well as $\mathfrak{g}$, $L$ and $G$) is solvable.

**15.16 Claim.** *Let* $Q \subset L$ *be the subgroup corresponding to the Lie subalgebra* $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{l}$. *Then* $Q$ *is closed and* $Q \cap V^{\mathbb{C}} = \{e\}$. *Hence* $L = V^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes Q$ *is a semidirect product.*
*Proof of the claim.* Let $\pi : \mathfrak{l} \to \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$ be the projection homomorphism. Our first observation is that $\pi(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$: The case '$\pi(\mathfrak{q}) = 0$' can clearly be excluded as in such a situation $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}}$, and in turn $\mathfrak{q} + \sigma\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}}$, which is absurd.
The possibility $\dim \pi(\mathfrak{q}) = 1$ can be ruled out as follows: We may assume that $\pi(\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (otherwise $\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}$ would be a subalgebra). Either $\pi(\mathfrak{f}) = 0$, i.e., $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f}$, and in turn $(\mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}) \cap \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{f}$: This leads to a contradiction since then $[\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{H}] \subset \mathfrak{H} \cap \mathfrak{v} = \mathfrak{F}$, violating (V). Or, $\pi(\mathfrak{f}) = \pi(\mathfrak{q})$. But then $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{f} \oplus \mathbb{C}\mathsf{x}$ with a nonzero $\mathsf{x} \in \mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}}$, and in turn $[\mathfrak{q}, \sigma\mathfrak{q}] \subset \mathfrak{q} \oplus \sigma\mathfrak{q}$, contradicting (III). Summarizing, $\pi(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$.
On the group level, since $L$ is simply connected and solvable, every connected subgroup is closed. The restriction of $\pi$ to $Q$ induces a surjective homomorphism $Q \to H^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since both groups are 2-dimensional, this homomorphism is a covering. Our assumption that $H^{\mathbb{C}}$ is simply connected finally implies that $\pi|_{Q} : Q \to H^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an isomorphism. In particular $Q \cap V^{\mathbb{C}} = Q \cap \ker \pi = \{e\}$. □

**15.17 Claim.** *With respect to the identification* $Z := L/Q = V^{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathbb{C}^3$ *the real form* $G$ *acts on* $L/Q$ *by affine transformations and* $V \subset G$ *by translations.*
*Proof of the claim.* The existence of the decomposition $L = V^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes Q$ implies that there are well-defined functions $v \colon L \to V^{\mathbb{C}}$, $q \colon L \to Q$ such that $\ell = v(\ell) \cdot q(\ell)$ for every $\ell \in L$. Let $g = w \cdot h \in V \rtimes H = G$ (with $w \in V, h \in H$) be arbitrary. Then, for any $z \in V^{\mathbb{C}}$ we have

$$g \cdot zQ = w \cdot h \cdot zQ = w \cdot v(h) \cdot q(h) \cdot zQ = w \cdot v(h) \cdot (q(h) \cdot z \cdot q(h)^{-1})Q$$

and $q(h) \cdot z \cdot q(h)^{-1} = v(h)^{-1} h \cdot z \cdot h^{-1} v(h) = h^{\mathrm{lin}}(z)$. Hence, with respect to the identification $V^{\mathbb{C}} = L/Q$ (induced by the inclusion $V^{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow L$ such that 0 corresponds to the point $eQ \in L/Q$), the action of $G$ can written as follows:

$$g \cdot z = h^{\mathrm{lin}}(z) + v(h) + w \qquad g = w \cdot h \in L, \quad z \in V^{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{15.18}$$

In particular, the subgroup $V \subset G$ acts by translations $z \mapsto z + w$. □

Consequently $M := G \cdot 0 = VH \cdot 0 = V + F \subset V \oplus iV$ with $F := M \cap iV$. It should be noted, however, that in general $F := (G\cdot 0)\cap iV \neq H\cdot 0$. Nevertheless, as we shortly will see, $F$ is affinely homogeneous under a slightly different subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(iV)$. Clearly, multiplying a tube manifold $F + iV \subset V \oplus iV$, $F \subset V$, by the imaginary unit $i$ we get the CR-equivalent realization $V + iF = V + F'$ with $F' = iF \subset iV$. The latter form of a tube manifold is more suitable in our particular setup, and we keep this notation until the end of the proof of the Main Lemma.

**15.19 Claim.** *Retaining the previous notation, there exists a subgroup* $B \subset iV \rtimes \mathrm{GL}(iV) = \mathrm{Aff}(iV)$ *such that* $F := (G\cdot 0)\cap iV = B\cdot 0$.

*Proof of the claim.* Let $\mathrm{pr}^i : V \oplus iV \longrightarrow iV$ be the linear projection. A glance at (15.18) shows that $F = \mathrm{pr}^i\{v(h) : h \in H\}$. In order to determine $v(h)$ more explicitly we need to analyze the position of $Q$ in $V^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes H^{\mathbb{C}}$ in greater detail: Since $\mathfrak{h}$ is 2-dimensional, there exists a basis $\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{n} \in \mathfrak{h}$ such that $[\mathsf{s}, \mathsf{n}] = \varepsilon\mathsf{n}$ with $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. Recall that the projection map $\pi : \mathfrak{q} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an isomorphism. Consequently there exist $\mathsf{w_s}, \mathsf{w_n} \in \mathfrak{v}^{\mathbb{C}} = V^{\mathbb{C}}$ such that the elements $\mathsf{w_s} + \mathsf{s}$ and $\mathsf{w_n} + \mathsf{n}$ in $\mathfrak{l} = V^{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$ generate $\mathfrak{q}$. Since then $\sigma\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}(\overline{\mathsf{w_s}} + \mathsf{s}) \oplus \mathbb{C}(\overline{\mathsf{w_n}} + \mathsf{n})$, we must have $\mathsf{w_s} \neq \overline{\mathsf{w_s}}$ and $\mathsf{w_n} \neq \overline{\mathsf{w_n}}$ (otherwise $\mathfrak{q} \cap \sigma\mathfrak{q} \neq 0$). Let $\exp : \mathfrak{l} \to L$ and $\mathrm{Exp} : \mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V^{\mathbb{C}})$ be the exponential maps (i.e., $\mathrm{Exp}(\mathrm{ad}\,\mathsf{v}) = \pi(\exp \mathsf{v})$ with $\pi$ as in the paragraph preceeding 15.14). Furthermore, let $\Psi$ be the entire function defined by

$$\Psi(z) = \frac{e^z - 1}{z} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{(k+1)!} z^k \,.$$

Then for $\mathsf{S}^t := \Psi(t\,\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s}))$ and $\mathsf{N}^u := \Psi(u\,\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{n}))$ a simple computation shows:

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \{\exp(t\mathsf{s})\cdot \exp(u\mathsf{n}) : t, u \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ Q &= \{\exp t(\mathsf{w_s} + \mathsf{s}) \cdot \exp u(\mathsf{w_n} + \mathsf{n}) : t, u \in \mathbb{C}\} \\ &= \{\mathsf{S}^t(t\mathsf{w_s})\cdot \exp(t\mathsf{s}) \cdot \mathsf{N}^u(u\mathsf{w_n})\cdot \exp(u\mathsf{n}) : t, u \in \mathbb{C}\} \\ &= \{\big(\mathsf{S}^t(t\mathsf{w_s})\cdot \mathrm{Exp}(t\,\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s}))\,(\mathsf{N}^u(u\mathsf{w_n}))\big) \cdot \exp(t\mathsf{s})\cdot \exp(u\mathsf{n}) : t, u \in \mathbb{C}\} \quad \subset \quad V^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot H^{\mathbb{C}} = L \,. \end{aligned} \tag{15.20}$$

The explicit form of $v(h)$ (compare the proof of Claim 15.17) can be read off the last line in (15.20):

$$v(h) = v(\exp(t\mathsf{s})\exp(u\mathsf{n})) = \big(\mathsf{S}^t(t\mathsf{w_s})\big)^{-1} \cdot \big(\,\mathrm{Exp}(t\,\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s}))\,(\mathsf{N}^u(u\mathsf{w_n}))\big)^{-1} .$$

Since $\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s})$, $\mathsf{N}^u$ and $\mathsf{S}^t$ are real operators, it follows for $h = \exp(t\mathsf{s}) \cdot \exp(u\mathsf{n})$ as before:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{pr}^i(v(h)) \;&=\; \big(\mathsf{S}^t(t\mathsf{w_s})\big)^{-1}\cdot \big(\,\mathrm{Exp}(t\,\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s}))\,(\mathsf{N}^u(u\mathsf{w_n}))\big)^{-1} \\ &=\; \exp t(-\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{s}} + \mathsf{s})\cdot \exp u(-\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{n}} + \mathsf{n}) \cdot 0 \;\subset iV \,. \end{aligned} \tag{15.21}$$

(Using additive notation, $\mathrm{pr}^i(v(h)) = -\mathsf{S}^t(t\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{s}}) - \mathrm{Exp}(t\,\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s}))\,(\mathsf{N}^u(u\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{n}})) \;\subset iV$ ). Define

$$\mathfrak{b} := \mathbb{R}(-\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{s}} + \mathsf{s}) \oplus \mathbb{R}(-\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{n}} + \mathsf{n}) \quad \subset \; \mathfrak{l} = V^{\mathbb{C}} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}^{\mathbb{C}}$$

and check that this is a Lie algebra. Then $B := \exp \mathbb{R}(-\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{s}} + \mathsf{s})\cdot \exp \mathbb{R}(-\mathsf{w}^i_{\mathsf{n}} + \mathsf{n})$ is the subgroup of $L$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{b}$, and (15.21) shows that $F = \mathrm{pr}^i\{v(h) : h \in H\} = B\cdot 0$. This finishes the proof of the claim and of the Main Lemma. □

## 16. The final steps

Our final step toward the complete classification of all 5-dimensional 2-nondegenerate and homogeneous CR-germs is to deduce that each 5-dimensional solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ which occurs in a CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ subject to 9.8, also satisfies the assumptions of the preceeding Main Lemma 15.14:

**16.1 Lemma.** *Let* $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ *be a CR-algebra satisfying* 9.8 *and suppose that* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is solvable and of dimension 5. Then there exists a semidirect product decomposition* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}$ *with a 3-dimensional abelian ideal* $\mathfrak{v} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ *and a 2-dimensional subalgebra* $\mathfrak{h}$.

*Proof.* We have already observed in Lemma 15.6 that the nilcenter $\mathfrak{z}$ has dimension 1 or 3. If $\dim\mathfrak{z} = 3$ then, due to (15.7), we can apply 15.8: Consequently, we can choose $\mathfrak{v} = [\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}]$ (compare (15.12)) and $\mathfrak{h}$ as defined in (15.13).

The situation $\dim\mathfrak{z} = 1$ requires some more elaborated work. We classify all CR-algebras $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$ under consideration in terms of the corresponding structure equations with respect to some perfect basis $\mathsf{x},\dots,\mathsf{z}$ of $\mathfrak{l}$ (see 15.5): Given $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q})$, let the corresponding structure equations be as in (15.1), taking into account (15.4). To handle the various sets of relations between the structure constants, we divide the class of CR-algebras under consideration into the subclasses A, B and C, see below.

**Case A: $\beta_1 \neq \pm 1$.** In this situation it is possible to assume $a_1 = 0$ (simply replace $\mathsf{x}$ by $\mathsf{x}+\lambda\mathsf{y}$ with $\lambda = u+iv$ defined by $u := \mathrm{Re}\,a_1/(1-\beta_1)$ and $v := \mathrm{Im}\,a_1/(1+\beta_1)$). The structure equations then read

$$
\begin{array}{lrcl}
 & [\mathsf{x},\bar{\mathsf{x}}] & = & \mathsf{z} + \qquad\qquad + a_2\mathsf{y} - \bar{a}_2\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
 & [\mathsf{x},\bar{\mathsf{y}}] & = & \beta_1\mathsf{x} + \bar{\mathsf{x}} + b_3\mathsf{y} + b_4\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
(16.2) & [\mathsf{y},\bar{\mathsf{y}}] & = & \mathsf{y} - \bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
 & [\mathsf{y},\mathsf{x}] & = & (1-\beta_1)\mathsf{x} \qquad + d_2\mathsf{y} \qquad\qquad d_2 = \bar{b}_3 + (1-\beta_1)b_4 \\
 & [\mathsf{z},\eta] & = & c_\eta\mathsf{z} \qquad \text{for every } \eta\in\mathfrak{l}\ ,
\end{array}
$$

and we now work out further constraints imposed on the constants: An explicit evaluation of the Jacobi identity $[[\mathsf{x},\bar{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{y}]] = 0$ yields $c_{\mathsf{y}} = c_{\bar{\mathsf{y}}} = 2\beta_1 - 1$. Furthermore, we obtain the equations $\bar{b}_3(1+\beta_1) = b_4(\beta_1^2 - \beta_2)$ and $\bar{b}_3(1+\beta_1) = (b_4 - \bar{b}_4)(\beta_1 - 1)$ which imply $b_4(1-\beta_1) = \bar{b}_4$.
In order to investigate most conveniently further relations between the structure constants, we deal separately with the following 3 subcases:

**AI:** $b_4 \in i\mathbb{R}^*$ and $\beta_1 = 2$, **AII:** $b_4 \in \mathbb{R}^*$ and $\beta_1 = 0$, **AIII:** $b_4 = 0$.

**Ad AI:** Put $\beta_4 := -ib_4$. In this particular situation the identity $[[\mathsf{x},\bar{\mathsf{x}},\mathsf{y}]] = 0$ implies $b_3 = -\frac{2}{3}i\beta_4$, $a_2 = -\frac{2}{9}\beta_4^2$ and $[[\mathsf{x},[,]]y]\mathsf{z} = 0$ implies $c_{\mathsf{x}} = -i\beta_4$. There are no more conditions imposed by the Jacobi identity and the structure equations of $\mathfrak{l}$ are now

$$
\begin{array}{lrcl}
 & [\mathsf{x},\bar{\mathsf{x}}] & = & \mathsf{z} + \qquad - 2\gamma^2\mathsf{y} + 2\gamma^2\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
 & [\mathsf{x},\bar{\mathsf{y}}] & = & 2\mathsf{x} + \bar{\mathsf{x}} - 2i\gamma\mathsf{y} + 3i\gamma\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
(16.3) & [\mathsf{y},\bar{\mathsf{y}}] & = & \mathsf{y} - \bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
 & [\mathsf{y},\mathsf{x}] & = & -\mathsf{x} \qquad - i\gamma\mathsf{y} \\
 & [\mathsf{z},\mathsf{x}] & = & -3i\gamma\,\mathsf{z} \qquad [\mathsf{z},\mathsf{y}] = -3\mathsf{z}\ ,
\end{array}
$$

where $\gamma := \beta_4/3 \in \mathbb{R}^*$. Keeping in mind Lemma 15.14, the structure of $\mathfrak{l}$, $\mathfrak{g}$ and the position of $\mathfrak{q}$ is determined by (16.3). This can be seen more clearly by decomposing $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{l}$ into the eigenspaces of $\mathrm{ad}(\mathsf{s})$, where $\mathsf{s} := -(\mathsf{y}+\bar{\mathsf{y}}/2$ : Define the following elements $\mathsf{n},\mathsf{v}_1,\mathsf{v}_2,\mathsf{v}_3$ from $\mathfrak{g}$ :

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathsf{n} & := & i\mathsf{x} - i\bar{\mathsf{x}} - \gamma\mathsf{y} - \gamma\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
\mathsf{v}_1 & := & \frac{i}{2}\mathsf{y} - \frac{i}{2}\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
\mathsf{v}_2 & := & \mathsf{x} + \bar{\mathsf{x}} - 2i\gamma\mathsf{y} + 2i\gamma\bar{\mathsf{y}} \\
\mathsf{v}_3 & := & 2i\mathsf{z}\ .
\end{array}
$$

It is clear that $\mathsf{s},\mathsf{n},\mathsf{v}_1,\mathsf{v}_2,\mathsf{v}_3$ form a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. The bracket relations are:

$$[\mathsf{s},\mathsf{v}_k] = k\mathsf{v}_k,\ [\mathsf{s},\mathsf{n}] = \mathsf{n}, \quad [\mathsf{n},\mathsf{v}_1] = \mathsf{v}_2,\ [\mathsf{n},\mathsf{v}_2] = \mathsf{v}_3,\ [\mathsf{n},\mathsf{v}_3] = 0.$$

Further, $\mathfrak{v} := \mathbb{R}\mathsf{v}_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\mathsf{v}_2 \oplus \mathbb{R}\mathsf{v}_3 \cong \mathbb{R}^3$ is an abelian ideal in $\mathfrak{g}$ with $[\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g}] = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{nil}} = \mathbb{R}\mathsf{n} \oplus \mathfrak{v}$. Hence, $\mathfrak{g}$ has the structure of the semidirect product $\mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}$ with $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{R}\mathsf{s} \oplus \mathbb{R}\mathsf{n}$ and the Main Lemma applies.

**Remark.** A direct verification shows that for every $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^*$ $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ in (16.3) is associated to Example 8.5.

We show that in the next case the Lie algebra cannot be solvable, hence, this case can be discarded.

**Ad AII:** Write $\beta_4 := b_4$. The Jacobi identity implies $a_2 = 0 = b_3$ and $d_2 = \beta_4$, and (15.9) reads

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[x, \overline{x}] & = & z \\
[x, \overline{y}] & = & \overline{x} + \beta_4 \overline{y} \\
[y, \overline{y}] & = & y - \overline{y} \\
[y, x] & = & x + \beta_4 y \\
[z, x] & = & \beta_4 z \qquad [z, y] = -z \,.
\end{array} \tag{16.4}$$

But then the linear span of the vectors

$$e^+ := y - \overline{y}, \qquad h := -\frac{1}{\beta_4}\big(x + \overline{x} + (\beta_4 - 1)y \ + \ (\beta_4 + 1)\overline{y}\big),$$
$$e^- := \frac{1}{4\beta_4^2}\big(2z + (2 - 2\beta_4)x + (2 + 2\beta_4)\overline{x} - (1 - \beta_4)^2 y + (1 + \beta_4)^2 \overline{y}\big)$$

is a copy of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{C})$ in $\mathfrak{l}$, that is, $\mathfrak{l}$ is not solvable.

**Ad AIII:**. The condition $b_4 = 0$ together with the Jacobi identity $[[x, \overline{x}, y]] = 0$ implies $a_2 = b_3 = 0$ and $c_y = 2\beta_1 - 1$. Since $(1 - \beta_1) \neq 0$, the identity $[z, [y, x]] = 0$ implies $[z, x] = 0$, see the table below.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
[x, \overline{x}] & = & z \\
[x, \overline{y}] & = & \beta_1 x \ + \ \overline{x} \\
[y, \overline{y}] & = & y - \ \overline{y} \\
[y, x] & = & (1 - \beta_1)x \\
[z, x] & = & 0 \qquad , \qquad [z, y] \ = \ (2\beta_1 - 1)z \,.
\end{array} \tag{16.5}$$

Select the following basis of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
n & := & \frac{i}{2}(x - \overline{x}) \qquad , \qquad s \ := \ \dfrac{1}{2 - 2\beta_1}(y + \overline{y}) \\
v_1 & := & iy \ - i\overline{y} \\
v_2 & := & x \ + \ \overline{x} \\
v_3 & := & iz \,.
\end{array}$$

One checks immediately that $\mathfrak{v} := \mathbb{R}v_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}v_2 \oplus \mathbb{R}v_3$ is an abelian ideal and $\mathfrak{h} := \mathbb{R}s \oplus \mathbb{R}n$ is a subalgebra with $[s, n] = n$. Further,

$$[s, v_j] = \frac{2 - j + (j - 1)\beta_1}{\beta_1 - 1} v_j \ \text{ for } \ j = 1, 2, 3 \quad \text{and} \quad [n, v_1] = v_2,\ [n, v_2] = v_3,\ [n, v_3] = 0.$$

Hence, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}$ as claimed, and the Main Lemma applies. Also in this case for all $\beta_1 \neq \pm 1$ the CR-algebra $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is associated to Example 8.5.

It remains to discuss the cases $\beta_1 = \pm 1$.

**Case B: $\boldsymbol{\beta_1 = 1}$.** Plugging $\beta_1$ into (15.4) gives $d_2 = \overline{b}_3$ and $d_1 = 0$. A direct check shows that $[[x, \overline{x}, y]] = 0$ implies $0 = b_3 = d_2$, i.e., $[x, y] = 0$. Lemma 15.8 then gives that $\mathfrak{g}$ is isomorphic to the semidirect product $\mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}$ with $\mathfrak{v} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ and the abelian subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ as defined in (15.13).

**Case C: $\boldsymbol{\beta_1 = -1}$.** We proceed as in the preceeding cases. Starting from the structure equations (15.1) with respect to some perfect basis $x, \overline{x}, y, \overline{y}, z$, we first evaluate (15.4) for this particular value of $\beta_1$. We get $d_1 = 2$ and $d_2 = \overline{b}_3 + 2b_4$. Next, the Jacobi identity $[[x, \overline{x}, y]] = 0$ implies $b_4 := \beta_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a_1 = \beta_4$. Further, $[[x, y, \overline{y}]] = 0$ implies $b_3 = -\beta_4 + i\gamma$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Next, $[[x, \overline{x}, y]] = 0$ determines the value of $a_2$ : $a_2 = (3\beta_4^2 + \gamma^2)/4 - i\beta_4\gamma/2$. Finally $[[x, y, z]] = 0$ implies $[z, x] = (3\beta_4/2 - 3i\gamma/2)z$, see diagram below:

$$
\begin{array}{rcllllll}
 & [x,\overline{x}] & = & z + \beta_4 x - \beta_4\overline{x} + a_2 y - \overline{a}_2\overline{y} & & a_2 = (3\beta_4^2 + \gamma^2)/4 - i\gamma\beta_4/2 \\
 & [x,\overline{y}] & = & -x + \overline{x} + b_3 y + \beta_4\overline{y} & & b_3 = -\beta_4 + i\gamma \\
(16.6) & [y,\overline{y}] & = & y - \overline{y} & & \\
 & [y,x] & = & 2x - b_4 y & & \\
 & [z,x] & = & (3\beta_4/2 - 3i\gamma/2)z & [z,y] = -3z\ . &
\end{array}
$$

Select the following basis of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
n &:= 2ix - 2i\overline{x} - ib_3 y + i\overline{b}_3\overline{y} \qquad & s &:= -\frac{1}{4}(y + \overline{y}) \\
v_1 &:= \frac{i}{2}y - \frac{i}{2}\overline{y} & & \\
v_2 &:= 2x + 2\overline{x} - b_3 y - \overline{b}_3\overline{y} & & \\
v_3 &:= 4iz\ . & &
\end{aligned}
$$

A direct computation (using (16.6)) shows that $\mathfrak{v} := \mathbb{R}v_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}v_2 \oplus \mathbb{R}v_3$ is an abelian ideal and

$$
[s, n] = n, \qquad
\begin{array}{lll}
[s, v_1] = -\frac{1}{2}v_1, & [s, v_2] = \frac{1}{2}v_2, & [s, v_3] = \frac{3}{2}v_3, \\
[n, v_1] = v_2, & [n, v_2] = v_3, & [n, v_3] = 0\ .
\end{array}
$$

Again, this shows that $\mathfrak{g}$ is isomorphic to the semidirect product $\mathfrak{v} \rtimes \mathfrak{h}$ with $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{R}n \oplus \mathbb{R}s$. Actually, an explicit realization of the corresponding CR-manifold $M$ along the lines of proof of the Main Lemma shows that $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q})$ is associated to the tube over the future light cone. □

We close by stating that Lemma 15.14 together with Lemma 16.1 finishes the proof of the classification theorem.

## References

1. Andreotti, A., Fredricks, G.A.: Embeddability of real analytic Cauchy-Riemann manifolds. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **6** (1979), 285–304.
2. Andreotti, A., Hill, C.D.: Complex characteristic coordinates and tangential Cauchy-Riemann equations. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Sci. Fis. **26** (1972), 299-324.
3. Beloshapka, V.K.: Symmetries of Real Hypersurfaces in Complex 3-Space. Math. Notes **78** (2005), 156–163.
4. Baouendi, M.S., Huang, X., Rothschild, L.P.: Regularity of CR mappings between algebraic hypersurfaces. Invent. Math. **125** (1996), 13-36.
5. Baouendi, M.S., Ebenfelt, P., Rothschild, L.P.: *Real Submanifolds in Complex Spaces and Their Mappings.* Princeton Math. Series **47**, Princeton Univ. Press, 1998.
6. Baouendi, M.S., Huang, X., Rothschild, L.P.: Regularity of CR mappings between algebraic hypersurfaces. Invent. Math. **125** (1996), 13-36.
7. Baouendi, M.S., Rothschild, L.P., Zaitsev, D.: Equivalences of real submanifolds in complex space. J. Differential Geom. 59 (2001), 301–351.
8. Boggess, A.: *CR manifolds and the tangential Cauchy-Riemann complex.* Studies in Advanced Mathematics. CRC Press. Boca Raton Ann Arbor Boston London 1991.
9. Bourbaki, N.: *Éléments de mathématique: groupes et algèbres de Lie.* Chapitre I-IX. Herman, Paris 1960.

10. Burns, D., Shnider, S.: Spherical hypersurfaces in complex manifolds. Invent. Math. **33** (1976), 223–246.
11. Cartan, É.: Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de l'espace de deux variables complexes. Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata **11/1** (1933) 17–90.
12. Chern, S.S., Moser, J.K.: Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds. Acta. Math. **133** (1974), 219-271.
13. Dadok, J.,Yang, P.: Automorphisms of tube domains and spherical hypersurfaces. Amer. J. Math. **107** (1985), 999-1013.
14. Doubrov, B., Komrakov, B., Rabinovich, M.: Homogeneous surfaces in the three-dimenaional affine geometry. In: *Geometry and Topology of Submanifolds, VIII,* World Scientific, Singapore 1996, pp. 168-178
15. Eastwood, M., Ezhov, V.: On Affine Normal Forms and a Classification of Homogeneous Surfaces in Affine Three-Space. Geometria Dedicata **77** (1999), 11-69.
16. Ebenfelt, P.: Normal Forms and Biholomorphic Equivalence of Real Hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$. Indiana J. Math. **47** (1998), 311-366.
17. Ebenfelt, P.: Uniformly Levi degenerate CR manifolds: the 5-dimensional case. Duke Math. J. **110** (2001), 37–80.
18. Fels, G.: Locally homogeneous finitely nondegenerate CR-manifolds. To appear. `arXiv:math.CV/0606032`
19. Fels, G., Kaup, W.: CR-manifolds of dimension 5: A Lie algebra approach. J. Reine Angew. Math, to appear. `http://arxiv.org/pdf/math.DS/0508011`
20. Gaussier, H., Merker, J.: A new example of a uniformly Levi degenerate hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$. Ark. Mat. **41** (2003), 85–94.
21. Hochschild, G.: *The structure of Lie groups.* Holden-Day, Inc., San Francisco-London-Amsterdam 1965
22. Knapp, A.W.: *Lie groups beyond an introduction.* Second edition. Progress in Mathematics **140**. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.
23. Hartshorne, R.: *Algebraic Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52**. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer 1977
24. Hörmander, L.: *An Introduction to Complex Analysis in Several Variables.* Third edition. North-Holland Publishing Co. Amsterdam - New York, 1990.
25. Isaev, A.V., Mishchenko, M.A.: Classification of spherical tube hypersurfaces that have one minus in the Levi signature form. Math. USSR-Izv. **33** (1989), 441-472.
26. Kaup, W., Zaitsev, D.: On local CR-transformations of Levi degenerate group orbits in compact Hermitian symmetric spaces. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **8** (2006), 465-490.
27. Loboda, A.V.: Homogeneous real hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ with 2-dimensional isotropy groups. Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova **235** (2001), 114-142 and Proc. Steklov Inst. Math **235** (2001), 107-135.
28. Loboda, A.V.: Homogeneous nondegenerate surfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ with two-dimensional isotropy groups. (Russian) translation in Funct. Anal. Appl. **36** (2002), 151–153.
29. Loboda, A.V.: On the determination of a homogeneous strictly pseudoconvex hypersurface from the coefficients of its normal equation. (Russian) translation in Math. Notes **73** (2003), 419–423.
30. Medori, C., Nacinovich, M.: Algebras of infinitesimal CR automorphisms. J. Algebra **287** (2005), 234–274.
31. Palais, R. S.: *A global formulation of the Lie theory of transformation groups.* Mem. AMS 1957.
32. Sakai, T.: *Riemannian geometry.* Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 149. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
33. Sergeev, A.G., Vladimirov, V.S.: Complex analysis in the future tube. In: *Several Complex Variables II,* Encyclopedia Math. Sci **8**, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer 1994.
34. Tanaka, N.: On the pseudo-conformal geometry of hypersurfaces of the space of $n$ complex variables. J. Math. Soc. Japan **14** (1962), 397-429.

Mathematisches Institut, Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany
e-mail: `gfels@uni-tuebingen.de`, `kaup@uni-tuebingen.de`